Durham E-Theses

Ratio finiendi: The Finality of the Holy Spirit in the Theology of St. Bonaventure

PIOLATA, THOMAS,ANTHONY

How to cite:

Use policy

RATIO FINIENDI: THE FINALITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE THEOLOGY OF ST. BONAVENTURE

Thomas Anthony Piolata OFM Cap.

Abstract

This study focuses on the theology of St. Bonaventure († 1274). It asks: How does the Holy Spirit fit into the shape and structure of Bonaventure's systematic theology? In answering this question, this study thereby aims to explicate Bonaventure's theology of the Holy Spirit. More specifically, the goal is to draw attention to and elucidate the finality of the Holy Spirit in Bonaventure's theology. To do this, the project is divided into two parts. Part One focuses on the finality of the Holy Spirit in the inner life of the Holy Trinity. Part Two turns to the economy, and focuses on the finality of the Holy Spirit in terms of creation/history and of the mission of Christ. This structure allows the author to present not only Bonaventure's theology of the Holy Spirit, but to develop a new synthesis of his theological system—from a pneumatological perspective. Ultimately, the project shows that Bonaventure not only has a refined theology of the Holy Spirit, but that the Holy Spirit is the culmination of the shape of his theological system as a whole.

Quest'indagine si concentra sulla teologia di San Bonaventura († 1274). Si pone la domanda: Come si inserisce lo Spirito Santo nella forma e nella struttura della teologia sistematica di Bonaventura? Nel rispondere a questa domanda, questo studio intende esplicitare la teologia dello Spirito Santo di Bonaventura. In modo più specifico, lo scopo è quello di richiamare l'attenzione ed enucleare la finalità dello Spirito Santo nella teologia di Bonaventura. Per fare questo, il progetto è diviso in due parti. La prima parte si concentra sulla finalità dello Spirito Santo nella vita interna della Santissima Trinità. La seconda parte si rivolge all'economia e si focalizza sulla finalità dello Spirito Santo rispetto alla creazione/storia e alla missione di Cristo. Questa struttura consente all'autore di presentare non solo la teologia bonaventuriana dello Spirito Santo, ma anche di sviluppare una nuova sintesi del suo sistema teologico—da una prospettiva pneumatologica. In definitiva, il progetto dimostra che Bonaventura non solo ha una raffinata teologia dello Spirito Santo, ma che lo Spirito Santo rappresenta il culmine della forma del suo sistema teologico nel complesso.

DURHAM UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY AND RELIGION

PONTIFICA UNIVERSITAS ANTONIANUM
FACULTAS THEOLOGIAE
Specialization in Dogmatic Theology

Thomas Anthony Piolata OFM Cap.

RATIO FINIENDI*: THE FINALITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE
THEOLOGY OF ST. BONAVENTURE*

Dissertatio ad Doctoratum

Supervisors: Rik Van Nieuwenhove (DU), Mary Melone SFA (PUA)
Readers (PUA): Carlos Salto Solá OFM, Amaury Begasse de Dhaem SJ

Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
To the Department of Theology and Religion at Durham University
And for the Doctorate in Sacred Theology (*cotutelle*)
To the Faculty of Dogmatic Theology at the Pontifical Antonianum
University

Dunelmensi – Romae: 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Note: All translations into English are my own, unless otherwise stated.

Bonaventure

For the Latin text, I primarily use the critical edition published by Quaracchi: *Doctoris Seraphici S. Bonaventurae Opera Omnia*, 10 vols. (Quaracchi: Ex Typographia Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1882-1902). References to the *Opera Omnia* will be parenthetical according to the format: (*volume number*:*page number*).

For Ferdinand Delorme's edition of the *Hexaemeron*: *Collationes in Hexaëmeron et bonaventuriana quaedam selecta* (Ad Claras Aquas: Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1934). Reference to this edition will be: (ed. Delorme, *page number*).

When citing Bonaventure's sermons, however, I use the editions of Jacques Guy Bougerol: *Sermones Dominicales*, ed. Jacques Guy Bougerol (Grottaferrata: Collegio S. Bonaventura, 1977); *Sermons de Diversis*, 2 vols., ed. Jacques Guy Bougerol (Paris: Les Editions Franciscaines, 1993). References to the *Sermones Domenicales* will be parenthetical according to the format: (*SD*:*page number*). References to the *Sermons de Diversis* will be parenthetical according to the format: (*SDD* 1 *or* 2:*page number*).

I, II, III, and *IV Sent*.	*Commentarius in quatuor libros Sententiarum Petri Lombardi*
Apol. paup.	*Apologia Pauperum contra Calumniatorem*
Brev.	*Breviloquium*
Don. Spir.	*Collationes de septem donis Spiritus sancti*
Dec. prae.	*Collationes de decem praeceptis*
Hex.	*Collationes in Hexaemeron*
In Ioann.	*Commentarius in Evangelium S. Ioannis*
In Luc.	*Commentarius in Evangelium S. Lucae*
Itin.	*Itinerarium mentis in Deum*
LMj.	*Legenda maior sancti Francisci*
Lign. vit.	*Lignum vitae*
Myst. Trin.	*Quaestiones disputatae de mysterio Trinitatis*
Perf. evang.	*Quaestiones disputatae de perfectione evangelica*
Quin. fest.	*De quinque festivitatibus pueri Iesu*
Red. art.	*De reductione artium ad theologiam*
Sci. Christi	*Quaestiones disputatae de scientia Christi*

Corpus Christianorum Series Latina

This series will be cited parenthetically as: (CCSL #:*page*).

CCSL 27	Augustinus, *Confessionum Libri XIII*, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 27, ed. L. Verheijen (Turnholt: Brepols, 1981).
CCSL 31	Augustinus, *Epistulae I-LV*, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 31, ed. K. D. Daur (Turnholt: Brepols, 2004).
CCSL 36	Augustinus, *In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus CXXIV*, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 36, ed. R. Willems (Turnholt: Brepols, 1954).
CCSL 50	Augustinus, *De Trinitate Libri I-XII*, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 50, ed. W. J. Mountain and F. Glorie (Turnholt: Brepols, 2001).
CCSL 91A	Fulgentius Ruspensis, *Opera II*, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 91A, ed. J. Fraipont (Turnholt: Brepols, 1968).

Francis of Assisi

When quoted, I use the English translation of Francis' writings: *Francis of Assisi: Early Documents*, vol. 1, *The Saint*, eds. Regis J. Armstrong, J. A. Wayne Hellmann and William J. Short (New York: New City Press, 1999). References to this volume will be parenthetical according to the format: (*FAED* 1:*page number*). At times, however, I slightly modify the translation according to Carlo Paolazzi's recent critical edition: *Francisci Assisiensis Scripta* (Grottaferrata: Collegii S. Bonaventurae ad Claras Aquas, 2009). When the translation is modified, I will make note of it in the corresponding footnote.

2LtF	The Second Letter to the Faithful
Ctc	The Canticle of the Creatures
ER	The Earlier Rule (*Regula non bullata*)
LR	The Later Rule (*Regula bullata*)
LtOrd	A Letter to the Entire Order

Peter Lombard's *Sententiae*

When quoted, I use Ignatius Brady's critical edition: *Sententiae in IV Libris Distinctae*, vol. 1, *Prolegomena* (Pars 1) and *Liber I et II* (Pars 2); vol. 2, *Liber III et IV* (Grottaferrata: Collegii S. Bonaventurae ad Claras Aquas, 1971 and 1981). References to the text will be parenthetical: (ed. Brady 1.2:*page number*).

I, II, III, and *IV Sent.*	*Sententiae in IV Libris Distinctae*

Summa Halensis

For the text of this early Franciscan *summa*, I use *Doctoris irrefragabilis Alexandri de Hales Ordinis minorum Summa Theologica*, 4 vols. (Quaracchi: Ex Typographia Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1924-1948). The division of this text is complicated and involves many layers. To aid with this complexity, the editors have numbered each basic discussion block with a number. For the sake of simplicity, I will bypass the multi-layered division

and refer only to the book number in Roman numerals, followed by the number that corresponds to the specific discussion piece, followed by a parenthetical reference to the volume number and page number. If helpful, I will include a further reference, such as, "resp." or "ad 4." For example: *SH* I, n. 297, ad 10 (1:427a).

Bible

For the text of biblical passages utilized by Bonaventure or other authors, I translate from the Latin of the respective critical edition. For the text of biblical passages being used not in reference to Bonaventure or a specific author, I use The New American Bible.

Church Documents

Unless otherwise stated, for Church documents (e.g., Vatican II documents, papal encyclicals), I will use the translations from www.vatican.va.

Distinctions in Texts

a. → articulus	ad → ad oppositum
au. → articulus unicus	c. → capitulum/caput
d. → distinctio	disp. → disputatio
fund. → fundamentum	lib. → liber
n. → numerus	opp. → oppositum
p. → pars	princ. → principium
prol. → prologus	prooem. → prooemium
q. → quaestio	resp. → respondeo
sol. → solutio	tract. → tractatus
v. → verse	vis. → visio

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

"All-powerful, most holy, Almighty and supreme God … we thank You for Yourself."
Francis of Assisi, *The Earlier Rule*, Chapter 23

I begin these acknowledgments by thanking Pope Benedict XVI. More than 15 years ago, I began reading his work. He was, in many ways, my first teacher of theology. I will remain forever grateful for the impact he has had on my life.

Along with Benedict, I would like to thank Msgr. Frank Lane from my home diocese in Columbus, Ohio—the first to introduce me to the Capuchins and to St. Bonaventure. Fr. Lane's love for the Church and his deep appreciation for the importance of theology, not to mention his own wisdom, has been life-giving to me.

This thesis could not have been written without the support and guidance of my two extremely supportive supervisors: Rik Van Nieuwenhove from Durham University and Sr. Mary Melone from the Pontifical Antonianum University. I express my utmost gratitude to both of them. It is an honor to be considered their student.

In addition to my supervisors, I thank my second supervisor at Durham, William Crozier, and Amaury Begasse de Dhaem SJ and Carlos Salto Solá OFM who were members of my doctoral Commission at the Antonianum. I should also like to thank Prof. Karen Kilby at Durham University, who generously helped me to establish a *cotutelle* partnership with the Antonianum.

Extremely special thanks is owed to Wayne Hellmann OFM Conv., whom I met almost 16 years ago as a freshman at Saint Louis University. In Wayne, I have found not only a teacher and mentor, but also a brother and friend. He has accompanied, supported, and encouraged me throughout my whole adult journey: as an undergraduate student, friar in formation, graduate student, and doctoral student. I would not be where I am today if it were not for his fraternal love, wise counsel, and unremitting support. Wayne: Thank you for always encouraging me to swim as far as I can swim. Truly, I cannot thank you enough, dear brother.

I thank also Dr. Jared Goff, Dr. Joshua Benson, Dr. Timothy Noone, and Dr. Mark Clark, all of whom, in addition to encouraging me in my study of St. Bonaventure, have been most generous in helping me understand the thought of the Seraphic Doctor. Thank you for putting up with my many emails and for your readiness to help a brother out.

"And the Lord gave me brothers," writes St. Francis in his *Testament*. Indeed, without the gift of my brothers, I would not be writing this today. In this regard, I want to express the utmost gratitude to my Capuchin Province. I would not have been given the freedom to pursue studies in the manner that

11

Dedicated to my father—my best friend,

Thomas P. Piolata
(1951-2021)

"Remember, I'll always be with you in your heart."

Not without merit, at the beginning of every good work,
is he to be called upon,
from whom every good comes forth originally,
through whom every good is produced exemplarily,
and to whom every good is brought back finally.
This is that ineffable Trinity,
Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

St. Bonaventure, *Soliloquium*, prol. 1 (8:28b)

INTRODUCTION

This study asks the following question: How does the Holy Spirit fit into the shape and structure of St. Bonaventure's systematic theology? The broad goal of this study is thus to explicate Bonaventure's theology of the Holy Spirit.

Notwithstanding the relative increase of studies on Bonaventure's thought, his pneumatology—especially in the English speaking world—remains largely untouched.[1] As Mary Melone has observed: "In the vast panorama of studies dedicated to the thought of the *magister* from

---

[1] Two exceptions are John F. Quinn, "The Rôle of the Holy Spirit in Bonaventure's Theology," *Franciscan Studies* 33 (1973): 273-284; Zachary Hayes, "The Doctrine of the Spirit in the Early Writings of St. Bonaventure," in *Doors of Understanding: Conversations in Global Spirituality in Honor of Ewert Cousins*, ed. Steven Chase (Quincy, IL: Franciscan Press, 1997), 179-198. In Italian, Mary Melone has written a series of articles on Bonaventure's pneumatology, all of which have helped to make this present study possible: Melone, "'*Donum in quo omnia alia dona donantur.*' Aspetti di teologia dello Spirito Santo in Bonaventura da Bagnoregio," *Ricerche teologiche* 17 (2006): 51-75; "Spiritus Sanctus," in *Dizionario Bonaventuriano*, ed. Ernesto Caroli (Padova: Editrici Francescane, 2008), 761-771; "Lo Spirito, dono di carità e guida alla verità, in san Bonaventura," *Doctor Seraphicus* 58 (2010): 57-73; "'*Spiritus Sanctus facit nos similes illi summae Trinitati.*' La funzione intratrinitaria e l'agire salvifico dello Spirito nel pensiero di Bonaventura," in *Bonawenturiański System Myślenia. Pytanie o Aktualność, 1217-2017*, ed. Romuald Henryk Kośla (Kraków: Calvarianum, 2018), 121-142. In addition to Melone's contributions, see Paolo Brambilla, "Lo Spirito agisce nella storia secondo la sua identità personale di dono e amore. Una lettura del *Commento alle Sentenze* di Bonaventura," *La Scuola Cattolica* 147 (2019): 229-256; Rossano Zas Friz de Col, "La manifestazione visibile dello Spirito Santo secondo San Bonaventura," in *La Personalità dello Spirito Santo*, ed. Sergio Tanzarella (Cinisello Balsalmo: San Paolo, 1998), 225-235; Johannes B. Freyer, "Der Hl. Geist als Band der Liebe nach Bonaventura," in *Das franziskanische Verständnis des Wirkens des Heiligen Geistes in Kirche und Welt*, ed. Herbert Schneider (Mönchengladbach: B. Kühlen Verlag, 2005), 44-50. Lastly, three studies on Bonaventure's trinitarian theology in general, which inevitably includes aspects of his pneumatology, deserve mention: Albert Stohr, *Die Trinitätslehre des heiligen Bonaventura. Eine systematische Darstellung und historische Würdigung* (Münster: Verlag der Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1923); Zachary Hayes, "Introduction," in *Disputed Questions on the Mystery of the Trinity*, Works of St. Bonaventure 3 (St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 1979), 11-103; Klaus Obenauer, *Summa Actualitas: Zum Verhältnis von Einheit und Verschiedenheit in der Dreieinigkeitslehre des heiligen Bonaventura* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1996).

Bagnoregio, those which have his theology of the Holy Spirit as their object represent, so to speak, a part that is without question the minority."[2] This project thus begins to fill a critical gap in the study of the Seraphic Doctor's theology.

More specifically, however, the goal of this study is to complete a trajectory of three studies that have unlocked key dimensions of Bonaventure's theological vision. The first is Wayne Hellmann's seminal study *Ordo: Untersuchung eines Grundgedankens in der Theologie Bonaventuras*, published in 1974.[3] In this work, Hellmann demonstrated the way in which *ordo* structures Bonaventure's whole thought-world. For Bonaventure, *ordo* consists of three elements: a beginning, a middle, and an end. Hellmann writes:

> The first element is the *principium*. There must always be a first or a beginning. Without a point from which to begin there can be no intelligibility. A starting point must actually begin something, and it must thereby point to an end or toward a goal. The end cannot likewise be understood unless it is seen in relation to the beginning or point of departure. The two extremes are brought into relationship by the middle or *medium*. Where there is a beginning, a middle, and an end, there is order.[4]

Ordo is the fundamental building block of a metaphysic rooted in the Holy Trinity—the *ordo perfectus*. The life of the Trinity is ordered, and the Trinity creates in a trinitarian manner. Accordingly, all of reality is ordered: "Order is not just a logical classification. Rather, it is the inner structure of all reality."[5]

The second study is Zachary Hayes' *The Hidden Center: Spirituality and Speculative Christology in St. Bonaventure*.[6] If Bonaventure's theology is grounded on this structural framework of *ordo*, then it makes sense that there should be a center (*medium*). The center of *ordo* is the second element.

---

[2] Melone, "*Donum in quo omnia alia dona donantur*," 51.

[3] Hellmann, *Ordo: Untersuchung eines Grundgedankens in der Theologie Bonaventuras* (München – Paderborn – Wien: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, 1974). I will use Jay M. Hammond's translation: *Divine and Created Order in Bonaventure's Theology* (St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 2001).

[4] Hellmann, *Divine and Created Order*, 10.

[5] Hellmann, *Divine and Created Order*, 12.

[6] Hayes, *The Hidden Center: Spirituality and Speculative Christology in St. Bonaventure* (St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 2000), original copyright 1981.

Consequently, Bonaventure's theological vision is profoundly Christocentric.[7] Hayes' study focuses on this aspect of Bonaventure's thought. The Uncreated Word is the middle person of the Holy Trinity, and the Incarnate Word is the *medium* and thus *mediator* between God and man. Indeed, Christ is the center of history and of all reality for the Seraphic Doctor. As Hayes eloquently remarks:

> Bonaventure sees Christ as the center of all things. The center of God (= *persona media*) as incarnate "holds the central position in all things." … He [Christ] is … the center of all reality. The Christological structure of reality which we first meet in history remains in the eternal kingdom of God, for Christ remains the center of being and of knowledge for eternity.[8]

The third study continues this trajectory. After Hayes had explicated the centrality of Christ, Robert Józef Woźniak turned to the first term of *ordo* in his study of God the Father in Bonaventure published in 2007: *Primitas et Plenitudo: Dios Padre en la teología trinitaria de san Buenaventura*.[9] Woźniak's study focuses on the firstness or primacy (*primitas*) of the Father, a key aspect of Bonaventure's trinitarian theology. Indeed, *primitas* is Bonaventure's own "neologism."[10] *Primitas* accentuates the significance of the first member of order. In terms of the Trinity, the Father is thus the *principium*—personal origin of the Son and the Holy Spirit. Ultimately, the Father, as Woźniak emphasizes, is "the origin and principle of all that exists."[11]

In sum: Hellmann's study unearthed *ordo* and Hayes and Woźniak explicated two fundamental dimensions of order: Christic centrality and the Father's firstness. What about the third term of *ordo*? Herein lies the contribution of the present study, the objective of which is not only to present Bonaventure's pneumatology, but to explicate the finality of the Holy Spirit.

---

[7] See n5 of Part One, Chapter Two below for a bibliography.

[8] Hayes, *The Hidden Center*, 196 and 203.

[9] Woźniak, *Primitas et Plenitudo: Dios Padre en la teología trinitaria de san Buenaventura* (Pamplona: Ediciones Universidad de Navarra, 2007).

[10] Woźniak, *Primitas et Plenitudo*, 91.

[11] Woźniak, *Primitas et Plenitudo*, 81.

For Bonaventure, "finality" is appropriated to the Holy Spirit—*ratio finiendi*.[12] One might object, however, that if "finality" is only an appropriation of, and thus not something proper to, the Holy Spirit, then I am exaggerating the significance of the Spirit's finality. Such an objection, however, does not take Bonaventure's trinitarianism seriously enough.[13] Bonaventure thinks trinitarianly, which the set of appropriations—*ratio principiandi et originandi* (→ the Father), *ratio exprimendi et exemplandi* (→ the Son), *ratio finiendi* (→ the Holy Spirit)—manifests.[14] Furthermore, for Bonaventure, appropriations have a certain density that they may not necessarily exhibit in other thinkers. That is, an appropriation has two poles: the divine essence or the divine person. An appropriation is an attribute said of the divine essence, but which, as Joshua Benson remarks, "may be restricted to a particular person to aid the understanding of the individual persons."[15] For Bonaventure, the "weight" of an appropriation falls on the side of the person. Appropriations "lead (*ducunt*) to the understanding and knowledge of what is proper (*proprium*), namely, of the three persons."[16] Furthermore, Bonaventure also refers to the Holy Spirit personally as *ratio*

---

[12] "Again, because the highest oneness and priority (*summe unum et primum*) possesses (*tenet*) the nature of principiating and originating (*ratio principiandi et originandi*); the highest beauty and splendor (*summe pulcrum et speciosum*) possesses the nature of expressing and exemplifying (*rationem exprimendi et exemplandi*); and the highest usefulness and goodness (*summe proficuum et bonum*) possesses the nature of completing (*ratio finiendi*), because 'the good and the end are the same.' From this (*hinc*) arises the third reason of appropriating: efficiency to the Father, exemplarity to the Son, and finality to the Holy Spirit." *Brev.*, 1.6.4 (5:215b).

[13] "One cannot read the works of Bonaventure for long without sensing that the mystery of the Trinity pervades the whole of his vision of reality. It is a fundamental structural component of his thought both in its broader vision and in its smaller units, and even conditions the choice of language and phraseology." Hayes, "Introduction," 30.

[14] "This causal triad [*ratio principiandi et originandi—ratio exprimendi et exemplandi—ratio finiendi*] is absent from the Lombard's index of appropriations. But it … bears the style-signature of the early Franciscan school, whose *Summa halensis* construes causality in exhaustively trinitarian terms." Justin Coyle, "Appropriating Apocalypse in Bonaventure's *Breviloquium*," *Franciscan Studies* 76 (2018): 99-136 at 105.

[15] Benson, "The Christology of the *Breviloquium*," in *A Companion to Bonaventure*, ed. Jay M. Hammond, J.A. Wayne Hellmann, and Jared I. Goff (Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2014), 247-287 at 262 (n44).

[16] *Brev.*, 1.6.1 (5:215a); see also Jared I. Goff, "Part I: 'On the Trinity of God,'" in *Bonaventure Revisited: Companion to the Breviloquium*, ed. Dominic Monti and Katherine Wrisley Shelby (St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 2017), 97-139 at 123-126; Hans Urs Von Balthasar, *The Glory of the Lord: A Theological Aesthetics*, vol. 2, *Studies in Theological Style: Clerical Style*, trans. Andrew Louth et al. (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2006), 291. For a helpful overview of the category of appropriations in trinitarian theology, see Gilles Emery, "Appropriation," in his *The Trinitarian Theology of St. Thomas Aquinas*, trans. Francesca Aran Murphy (Oxford – New York: Oxford University, 2007), 312-337.

terminantis complementi, inasmuch as the Spirit "terminates the divine persons (*divinas personas terminare*)"—brings the personal dynamic of Trinitarian life to its completion.[17] The Holy Spirit is the *ratio tertii*, the *extremum* of divine life.[18]

What do these terms mean? How does the "finality" of the Holy Spirit shape Bonaventure's theology? This study proposes an answer. It draws attention to and explicates the finality of the Holy Spirit in Bonaventure's theology.

To do so, I divide this study into two parts. Part One, "The Order of the Trinity and the Finality of the Holy Spirit," focuses on the finality of the Holy Spirit within the inner life of the Holy Trinity. This part is divided into three chapters: Chapter One is on the Father, Chapter Two on the Son, and Chapter Three on the Holy Spirit. The most substantial chapter in Part One is the third chapter: therein, I present Bonaventure's dogmatic theology of the third person of the Holy Trinity. In the end, this first part effectively constitutes a study of Bonaventure's trinitarian theology. Yet, it is not a general study of the persons of the Trinity. Rather, it studies the Father and the Son in view of the Holy Spirit. One might call Part One a pneumatological study of the Trinity.

Part Two, "Creation and the Finality of the Holy Spirit," then turns to the economy, the Trinity *ad extra*. It is divided into two chapters. Chapter One is panoramic in its scope. Therein, I consider the finality of the Holy Spirit in terms of the created order—of the world and of time—as a whole. For Bonaventure creation has a beginning and an end: he thus speaks of the *decursus mundi* and the whole story of the world as a beautiful and well ordered *carmen*. This chapter thus considers the way in which the *decursus* and *carmen* evince pneumatic finality. In the course of this chapter, important themes explored include: Bonaventure's metaphysics of the circle, the structure of the *Breviloquium*, the Third Commandment and charity, the pilgrimage of human life/Bonaventure's anthropology, and Bonaventure's theology of history.

---

[17] *Hex.*, 1.12 (5:331b).
[18] See the beginning of Chapter Three of Part One below for references.

Chapter Two, then, enters into the *carmen*. In particular, the focus of Chapter Two is the pneumatic finality of Christ's mission. For Bonaventure, the mission of Christ culminates pentecostally in the sending of the Holy Spirit. This chapter unpacks Bonaventure's theology of Christ as "giver of the Holy Spirit" and the relation of Christ's Ascension to Pentecost; *reparatio*, *adoptio*, and the "pneumatic form" of Christian existence; and Bonaventure's sacramental theology, especially the finality of the Holy Spirit in his eucharistic theology.

The structure of this study thus allows me not only to present Bonaventure's theology of the Holy Spirit, but also to develop a new synthesis of his theological system. In so doing, this study highlights and explicates the—underappreciated—theology and relevance of the Holy Spirit in the Seraphic Doctor.

PART ONE

The Order of the Trinity and the Finality of the Holy Spirit

This part of the present study focuses on the inner life of the Triune God—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. The goal is to explicate Bonaventure's theology of the Trinity with a focus on the Spirit—the *ratio finiendi*, the *ratio terminantis complementi* of the infinite life of the three-personed *Primum Principium*. What follows, therefore, does not constitute an exhaustive treatment of Bonaventure's trinitarian theology. To achieve the goal of this part of the study, I divide it into three chapters. This threefold structure will follow the *ordo perfectus* of the Trinity itself. Chapter One focuses on the fontal source of divine life, namely, the Father—*ratio principiandi et originandi*. Chapter Two focuses on the centrality of divine life, namely, the Son—*ratio exprimendi et exemplandi*. Chapter Three, the culmination of this Part of the study, focuses on the finality of divine life, the Holy Spirit—*ratio finiendi*.[1]

---

[1] See *Brev.*, 1.6.4 (5:215b).

The Father: *Ratio principiandi et originandi*

In Bonaventure's masterfully constructed *Quaestiones disputatae de mysterio Trinitatis*, the text reaches its own zenith in question 8: "Utrum possit simul stare trinitas cum summa primitate."[1] The question is thus about *primitas*, a key theological term for the Seraphic Doctor.[2] In fact, the reader of the text cannot but become almost immediately aware of its importance: unlike the preceeding seven questions, each divided into two articles, this eighth question consists of only one article.[3] The "ultimate point of convergence"[4] of the text thus focuses exclusively on the Trinity. Bonaventure thereby reduces the two article structure into a one article

---

[1] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 8 (5:112). Cf. Zachary Hayes, "Introduction," 100. In addition to Hayes, for an excellent study of this set of disputed questions, see Jared Goff, *Caritas in Primo: A Study of Bonaventure's Disputed Questions on the Mystery of the Trinity* (New Bedford, MA: Academy of the Immaculate, 2015). For studies focusing on various aspects of the *Myst. Trin.*, see Jared Goff, "Divine Infinity in Bonaventure's *Disputed Questions on the Mystery of the Trinity*," in *Ordo et Sanctitas: The Franciscan Spiritual Journey in Theology and Hagiography: Essays in Honor of J.A. Wayne Hellmann, O.F.M. Conv.*, ed. Michael Cusato et al. (Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2017), 165-185; Carmelo Pandolfi, "Le parole di Dio nella parola di Dio. Riflessioni sulle *Quaestiones disputatae de mysterio Trinitatis* di san Bonaventura," *Doctor Seraphicus* 64 (2016): 71-124; and John Dourley, "The Relationship Between Knowledge of God and Knowledge of the Trinity in Bonaventure's *De mysterio Trinitatis*," in *San Bonaventura maestro di vita francescana e di sapienza cristiana*, vol. 2, ed. Alfonso Pompei (Rome: Pontificia Facoltà Teologica San Bonaventura, 1976), 41-48.

[2] I treat the significance of this term below in Section One.

[3] The two article structure of the *De mysterio Trinitatis* is significant. Aside from the first question, which constitutes the *praeambula* of the text, the first article of questions 2-7 asks about a given divine attribute in terms of the *esse divinum*, and the second article asks about that same attribute, but in terms of the Trinity. Goff (*Caritas in Primo*, 192) explains: "The two-article construction of each question shows forth the *intrinsic*, even on a conceptual level, relationship between the absolute attributes and personal properties of God. The first article of each question treats a given absolute attribute of God and provides a first, partial illumination of the mystery of the divine essence (*resolutio semiplena*). … The second article of each question, in taking up the compatibility of the absolute attribute discussed in the first article with the doctrine of the Trinity, provides more light in which to understand the mystery of God (*resolutio plena*)" (see also Goff, 204-205).

[4] Goff, *Caritas in Primo*, 288.

conclusion: God is First Principle *precisely as* Triune.[5] Primacy (*primitas*) characterizes God, in other words, not only in the order of essences, but it also—and even more fundamentally—intimates the intrinsic order of persons constitutive of the very divine being itself. *Primitas* of the essence intimates the personal *primitas* of the Father: the *primitas Trinitatis* ultimately pivots on the *primitas Patris*.

Insofar that God is *Primum principium*, then, God is a trinity of persons. "By the mere fact," as Hayes states, "that God is the first principle, He is necessarily a trinity."[6] The primacy of the First Being is ultimately rooted in the personal primacy of the first divine person.[7] As Filippo Ciampanelli puts it: "To speak about God as the principle of every essence does not suffice for the theologian; for the Franciscan author [Bonaventure], it is necessary to locate in the person of the Father the fundamental and corresponding presupposition in God himself, as the ultimate root of every existence."[8]

The Father is thus, so Bonaventure concludes, the *fons vitae* (Ps 35:10)[9]—i.e, the *principium totius divinitatis*, a term to which he will happily refer in his earlier *Commentarius in Librum Sententiarum*.[10] Hence the ordered life of the Holy Trinity springs forth from the innascible first person:

---

[5] Bonaventure concludes his response: "And for this reason Rachel, which designates the contemplative life, is interpreted as 'the principle is seen,' because he who sees this insofar as it is the first principle, finds rest (*habet suae conditionis statum*) and the goal of his desires (*desiderium terminatum*); this goal is not reached, unless the first principle is seen clearly, there where it is three and supremely one." *Myst. Trin.*, q. 8, resp. (5:114b).

[6] Hayes, "Introduction," 100.

[7] "This fontality (*fontalitas*) [of the Father] is in a certain way the origin of the other fontality [i.e., of creation]." *Myst. Trin.*, q. 8, ad. 7 (5:115b). Bernard McGinn speaks of a "double primacy in God" for Bonaventure: "the primacy of the Father as the source of the Son and Spirit, and the primacy of all three persons with respect to creation." "The Dynamism of the Trinity in Bonaventure and Eckhart," *Franciscan Studies* 65 (2007): 137-155 at 144. See also Woźniak, *Primitas et plenitudo*, 92-93; Luc Mathieu, "Introduction: La doctrine trinitaire de saint Bonaventure," in Bonaventure, *Breviloquium*, vol. 1, *La Trinité de Dieu* (Paris: Editions Franciscaines, 1967), 5-48 at 41. Ultimately, then, the antecedent condition for the possibility of creation is the Trinity. See *Hex.*, 11.9 (5:381b); Filippo Ciampanelli, *«Hominem reducere ad Deum». La funzione mediatrice del Verbo incarnato nella teologia di san Bonaventura* (Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2010), 75.

[8] Ciampanelli, *Hominem reducere ad Deum*, 67.

[9] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 8, ad 7 (5:115b); see also *Sermo 52*, §3 (*SDD* 2:669-670). Cf. Alejandro de Villalmonte, "El Padre Plenitud Fontal de la Deidad," in *S. Bonaventura 1274-1974*, vol. 4, *Theologica*, ed. Jacques Guy Bougerol (Grottaferrata: Collegio S. Bonaventura, 1974), 221-242 at 223.

[10] See, e.g., *I Sent.*, d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 2, ad 3 (1:470a-472b); *I Sent.*, d. 29, dub. 1 (1:516a-517a). The phrase is certainly Augustinian (see, e.g., *De Trin.*, IV.20.29 [CCSL 50:200]) and is utilized by Peter Lombard (e.g., *I Sent.*, d. 29, c. 1, §2 [ed. Brady 1.2:215]) and the early Franciscan *Summa Halensis* (e.g., *SH* I, n. 297, ad 10 [1:427a]). The *Summa Halensis* was composed between 1236-1245 at Paris by a team of Franciscans led by

If there is *summa primitas*: but *quanto aliquid prius, tanto fecundius est et aliorum principium*.[11] Therefore, just as the divine essence, because it is first (*quia prima*), is the principle of other essences, so the person of the Father, since it is first, because from no one (*quia a nullo*), is principle and has fecundity with respect to the [other divine] persons.[12]

The goal of this chapter is to articulate a theology of the Father, in whom the *primitas* of divine life lies. In synthesis, he is the originless origin (= *a nullo*) of the dynamic order of divine life, an order which culminates in the Love that is the Holy Spirit. The Father's primacy is intrinsically heterotelic: its fecundity terminates in the Son and the Spirit. It thereby finds its ultimate realization in the completion of trinitarian order, namely, in the *nexus* of love that is the Spirit. *Primacy* is ordered to love: not only to the *dilectus*, but also to the *condilectus*, "the love, by which the Father loves the Son."[13] Accordingly, intending to arrive at a theology of the Spirit as *ratio finiendi* of divine life, to which Chapter Three below will attend directly, I begin here with the primordial and innascibile source of the trinitarian life of God.

I divide this chapter into three sections. In the first section, I offer a brief overview of Bonaventure's theology of *primitas*. Then, in section two, I explicate Bonaventure's theology of divine infinity, especially as articulated in his *De mysterio Trinitatis*. I argue that the fontality implied by *primitas* realizes itself infinitely via the generation of the Son and spiration of the Holy Spirit. In the third section, I offer a concluding synthesis reflecting on the

---

Alexander of Hales who joined the Order in 1236. It became a key text within the emerging Franciscan Order and intellectual tradition. See Lydia Schumacher, ed., *The Legacy of Early Franciscan Thought* (Walter De Gruyter, 2020); *Idem*, ed., *The Summa Halensis: Sources and Context* (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 2020); *Idem*, ed., *The Summa Halensis: Doctrines and Debates* (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 2020). With regards to the theology of the Father as origin of divinity: this was codified at the councils of Toledo VI, Toledo XI and Toledo XVI. Cf. Theresia Hainthaler, "God the Father in the Symbols of Toledo: *fons et origo totius trinitatis*," *International Journal of Orthodox Theology* 1 (2010): 125-136; Nicholas Lombardo, "The 'Monarchy' of God the Father," *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 24 (2022): 324-351.

[11] This principle comes from the *Liber de Causis*, which constitutes a crucial aspect of Bonaventure's theology of the Divine Being. See n22 and n85 below.

[12] *I Sent.*, d. 2, au., q. 2, fund. 4 (1:53ab).

[13] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 3, fund. 2 (1:199a). See also *I Sent.*, d. 32, a. 1, q. 1-2. This idea will be treated in greater detail below in Chapter Three of Part One.

relationship between the *primum* and the *ultimum*, the Father and the Holy Spirit.

1. *Primitas*: The Fontal Fullness of the First

Primitas, as Luc Mathieu affirms, is a notion not only fundamental to the thought of Bonaventure, but also one that endows his trinitarian theology with originality.[14] Indeed, Woźniak claims that the term is Bonaventure's own "neologism" and argues that it is a "central concept" in his trinitarian theology.[15] Ciampanelli avers that the *primitas* of the Father "conceptually signals the beginning of the bonaventurean theological system."[16] In a word, as mentioned above, *primitas* speaks to the Father precisely as principle: as *first*, he is the fontal source—i.e., principle—of the Son and the Spirit. *Ideo principium, quia primum*.[17]

1.1 *Primitas and Innascibility*

In *I Sent.*, d. 2, Bonaventure individuates four reasons that grant a plurality of persons in God: *summa beatitudo*, *summa perfectio*, *summa simplicitas*, and *summa primitas*.[18] Here, then, Bonaventure introduces his theology of *primitas*. The key point is that the term interprets the innascibility of the first person positively: innascibility bespeaks "fontal fullness (*fontalis plenitudo*)."[19] Without origin (*innascibilitas*), the Father is *a nullo*. This

---

[14] See Mathieu, "Primitas," in *Lexique Saint Bonaventure*, ed. Jacques Guy Bougerol (Paris: Éditions Franciscaines, 1969), 109-110; *Idem*, "Primitas," in *Dizionario Bonaventuriano*, 627.

[15] Woźniak, *Primitas et plenitudo*, 91. Cf. Hayes, "Introduction," 102.

[16] Ciampanelli, *Hominem reducere ad Deum*, 69.

[17] *I Sent.*, d. 7, au., q. 2, resp. (1:139a); see also *I Sent.*, d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 2, ad 3 (1:470b). In addition to the studies cited above, for treatments of God the Father in Bonaventure see also Hellmann, *Divine and Created Order*, 57-61; Stohr, *Trinitätslehre*, 124-137; Luc Mathieu, *La Trinità creatrice*, trans. Paolo Canali (Milano: Edizioni Biblioteca Francescana), 38-56 and 67-72; Miguel Oltra, "Introducción General: La santisima Trinidad y los dones del Espíritu Santo en san Buenaventura," in *Obras de san Buenaventura*, vol. 5, ed. Bernardo Aperribay et al. (Madrid: Biblioteca de autores cristíanos, 1948), 1-86 at 22-26.

[18] *I Sent.*, d. 2, au., q. 2 (1:53-54). See Mary Melone, "La vita di Dio, *summa bonitas et caritas*, nel mistero della Trinità: il fondamento della comunione e della creazione," *Doctor Seraphicus* 62 (2014): 7-23 at 8-15.

[19] "By the reason of primacy (*primitatis*) a person is meant to produce another from itself (*nata est ex se aliam producere*); and I call this primacy innascibility, by which reason, as the ancient opinion suggests (*antiqua opinio*), there is fontal fullness (*fontalis plenitudo*)

negative characteristic, however, does not only bespeak the Father's lack of origin. For Bonaventure, it affirms actual ontological fecundity: that is, the Father's "fontal fullness in producing" the Son by way of generation and the Spirit by way of spiration.[20] This positive reading of innascibility finds succinct expression in the *Breviloquium*:

> For it is proper to the Father that he is innascible or unbegotten, the principle without principle and Father; innascibility designates him through the mode of negation, although as a consequence through the mode of affirmation (*ex consequenti per modum positionis*), because innascibility in the Father posits fontal fullness (*ponit fontalem plenitudinem*).[21]

At play here is an important neoplatonic idea inspired by the *Liber de Causis*: "Quanto aliquid prius, tanto fecundius est et aliorum principium."[22] This maxim, however, does not lead Bonaventure to posit necessary emanation *ad extra*—which is, in effect, the neoplatonic position.[23] It rather

---

in the Father for every emanation (*ad omnem emanationem*)." *I Sent.*, d. 2, au., q. 2, resp. (1:54a). The term "fontal fullness" is not unique to Bonaventure. As James Krueger points out, it surfaces earlier in the *Summa Halensis* (e.g, I, n. 481 [1:683-685]) and in William of Auxerre's *Summa Aurea* (e.g., lib. 1, tract. 8, c. 5 [ed. Jean Ribaillier (Grottaferrata: Collegii S. Bonaventurae ad Claras Aquas, 1980)], 135); see Krueger, "God the Father in the Western Tradition: Bringing Augustine and Bonaventure into Conversation with Modern Theology," (PhD diss., The Catholic University of America, 2014), 270 (n59). Richard of St. Victor also speaks of *plenitudo divinitatis* in terms of the Father in his *De Trinitate* 5.7 (*De Trinitate*, ed. Jean Ribaillier [Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1958] 203).

[20] *I Sent.*, d. 28, au., q. 2, resp. (1:500a).

[21] *Brev.*, 1.3.7 (5:212a). See also *I Sent.*, d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 2, ad 3 (1:470a-472b). The positive interpretation that Bonaventure gives to *innascibilitas* is not entirely unique to him. It is implicit in the theology of St. Hilary and later in Richard of St. Victor in the 12th century. It finds, however, its culminating and thematic expression—passing through others like William of Auxerre, William of Auvergne and Alexander of Hales—in the Seraphic Doctor. See Stohr, *Trinitätslehre*, 126-129; Antonio Zigrossi, *Saggio sul neoplatonismo di s. Bonaventura. Il concetto di unità e la struttura del reale come problema teologico* (Firenze: Edizioni Studi Francescani, 1954), 50-52.

[22] See n12 above; *I Sent.*, d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 2, ad 3 (1:471a). For Bonaventure's use of this principle from the *Liber de Causis*, see my comments at n85 below. The *Liber de Causis* is a Latin translation of an Arabic text based upon Proclus' *Elements of Theology*. See Cristina D'Ancona, "The *Liber de causis*," in *Interpreting Proclus*: *From Antiquity to the Renaissance*, ed. Stephen Gersh (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2014), 137-161; Pasquale Porro, "The University of Paris in the Thirteenth Century: Proclus and the *Liber de causis*," in *Interpreting Proclus*, 264-298.

[23] Admittedly, Plotinus' position is not so black and white. Nonetheless, the kind of derivation that comes from the One in Plotinus, which ultimately includes the world, is fundamentally different than *intrinsic* fontality of *primitas* in Bonaventure. Regarding the difficulties, however, of ascribing a creationist or emanationist metaphysics (or neither) to Plotinus, see Lloyd Gerson, "Plotinus's Metaphysics: Emanation or Creation?," *The Review of Metaphysics* 46 (1994): 559-574.

leads to a personalist theology of the Divine.[24] There is fecundity *in* God, and this fecundity is the ground for a plurality of persons that are, in turn, constitutive of the divine essence itself. Bonaventure locates this fontality in the Father, who, as sourceless source of divine life, is first in the order of origins. The Father is thereby personally productive of the second and third person of the Holy Trinity.

If the Father is prior, however, it is not in the order of nature, as is the case of the One in Plotinus' metaphysics. Revelation of the Triune God revolutionizes metaphysical inquiry: it unearths priority at a deeper level. The priority of the Father lies in the order according to origin.[25] Bonaventure's theology of *primitas* is thus fundamentally a part of his grand theological metaphysics of order. In fact, Bonaventure can apply the principle taken from the *Liber de Causis* to the Trinity precisely because there is an *ordo personarum*:

> Where there is an order of persons (*ordo personarum*), primacy in the first person is the reason for producing the others (*ratio producendi alias*), and since innascibility bespeaks primacy, hence it bespeaks fontal plenitude with respect to personal production (*fontalem plenitudinem respectu productionis personalis*).[26]

There could be no *primum* in God without *ordo* in God. "Ubi est perfectus ordo, ibi est ratio principii, medii et ultimi."[27] Bonaventure's metaphysics of *ordo* is itself illuminative of the finality of the Holy Spirit—*ultimum* of the *ordo personarum*. There is not an infinite number of persons that emanate

---

[24] Bonaventure overcomes what Hayes calls the "impersonal tone of the Dionysian definition of the good." See his "Bonaventure: Mystery of the Triune God," in *The History of Franciscan Theology*, ed. Kenan B. Osborne, 39-115 at 56. In other words, Bonaventure's trinitarian metaphysics is personal in its foundation, structure, and content: it is primarily about the persons—not the abstract essence, which, apart from the persons, is *not*. The stress thus falls on the person(s), and to be personal implies more than one person.

[25] See, for example, *I Sent.*, d. 20, a. 2, q. 1, resp. (1:372b-373a); *Myst. Trin.*, q. 5, a. 2, ad 1 (5:95a); *Myst. Trin.*, q. 8 (5:112-115); Hayes, "Introduction," 93-94.

[26] *I Sent.*, d. 27, p.1, au., q. 2, ad 3 (1:471a). The argument commences with reference to the *Liber de Causis*: "principia quanto sunt priora, tanto potentiora" (1:471a). See also *Myst. Trin.*, q. 4, a. 2, fund. 1 (5:84b); Hellmann, *Divine and Created Order*, 10-11; Woźniak, *Primitas et plenitudo*, 196. At the same time, the metaphysical principle is itself suggestive of plurality in God.

[27] *Hex.*, 11.7 (5:381a).

from the first person, because that would be repugnant to the bonaventurean metaphysics of order.[28] Rather, there is *status* in the Holy Spirit.[29]

When Bonaventure thus responds to certain contrary arguments in question 8 of *De mysterio Trinitatis*, it should not surprise that he refers to order. For example, the first two contrary arguments maintain that there cannot coherently be a plurality of firsts. But if the Holy Trinity is a plurality of persons, then it would seem there is in fact a plurality of firsts. To respond, Bonaventure explains that such arguments hold only in the hypothetical case of a plurality of firsts in terms of essences. After all, a plurality of essences *essentialiter differentes* can only be ordered to one another "according to the reason of priority and posteriority." This situation, however, does not correspond to the trinity of divine persons. In the Divine Being, that is, there is an intrinsic order not of essences, but of persons. And this *ordo* obtains not on account of priority and posterioty, but on account of origin (*ratio originis*).[30] All three persons are equally *essentially* first as the one Divine Essence, but the Father is *personally* first.[31] This firstness of the Father does not diminish the nobility of the second and third person.[32] It rather indicates that the order of divine life springs forth from the Father.[33] To echo Bonaventure:

> If therefore *primum* is said *per privationem anterioris*, then they [the divine persons] are equally first, because nothing is there [in the Trinity] before and after. If however *primum* is said *per privationem originis*, namely, because it is born from no one, then the *ratio primitatis* resides principally in the person of the Father, for which reason the fontal fullness to produce the other persons is in him.[34]

---

[28] "Again, infinity in God does not take away from the perfection of order … but the order of perfection necessarily posits a first, a center, and an end (*primum, medium et ultimum*)." *Myst. Trin.*, q. 4, a. 2, fund. 2 (5:84b). See also *I Sent.*, d. 2, au., q. 3 (1:54-55). Richard of St. Victor deserves explicit mention here, inasmuch as he argues for the necessity of intrinsic plurality in God, and then specifes that this plurality is a trinity of persons—no more or and no less. On this point, see Mary Melone, *Lo Spirito Santo nel De Trinitate de Riccardo di S. Vittore* (Roma: Pontificium Athenaeum Antonianum, 2001), 131-146.

[29] See my concluding comments under Section 2.2 below.

[30] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 8, ad 1-2 (5:114b). See also *Itin.*, 6.3 (5:311a).

[31] See *Myst. Trin.*, q. 8, ad 5 (5:115a); see also Hellman, *Divine and Created Order*, 25-28 where he distinguishes between the vertical order of essences and the horizontal order of persons within the Trinity.

[32] See *Hex.*, 1.12 (5:331b).

[33] Accordingly, the order that originates from the Father thus finds its culmination in the Spirit, *ratio ultimi*.

[34] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 8, ad 4 (5:115a).

1.2 *Primitas and Productivity*

Innascibility, then, bespeaks primacy and primacy bespeaks fontal fullness. In other words, *primitas* is the ontological feature of the Father that indicates his role, so to speak, in the narrative of the intrinsic life of the Holy Trinity. It is the primordial ground of eternal fecundity: the generation of the Son and spiration of the Spirit. This productive actuality of *primitas* finds eloquent expression in the response to question 8 of the *De mysterio Trinitatis*:

> For the supreme primacy (*primitas summa*) in the supreme (*summo*) and highest (*altissimo*) principle posits supreme actuality (*actualitatem*), supreme fontality (*fontalitatem*) and supreme fecundity (*fecunditatem*). For the First Principle, because it is first, is most perfect in producing, most fontal in emanating, and most fecund in germinating (*perfectissimum in producendo, fontalissimum in emanando, fecundissimum in pullulando*). Since, therefore, perfect production, emanation, and germination take place only according to two intrinsic modes (*duos modos intrinsecos*)—namely through the mode of nature and through the mode of will (*per modum naturae et per modum voluntatis*), namely of the word and of love—then it is necessary to posit there by reason of the most supreme perfection, fontality, and fecundity, the twofold mode of emanating with respect to the two hypostases brought forth, emanating from the first person as from the first producing principle; and thus it is necessary to posit three persons.[35]

As supremely actual, fontal, and fecund, *primitas* exhibits a certain heterotelic vibrancy: its realization—in the sense of complete manifestation and expression—is beyond itself. That is, the realization of the vibrancy intrinsic to *primitas* lies in the generation of the Son and spiration of the Spirit. Consequently, so Bonaventure concludes, the three persons are "co-equal, co-eternal, and consubstantial."[36]

---

[35] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 8, resp. (5:114a). I am following Hayes in translating *pullulare* as "to germinate." The two modes of emanation—*per modum naturae* and *per modum voluntatis*—derive ultimately from Aristotle as the two perfect modes of production (see Bonaventure, *I Sent.*, d. 2, a. 1, q. 4, fund. 2 [1:56b]). See Goff, *Caritas in Primo*, 259-260; Russel L. Friedman, *Intellectual Traditions at the Medieval University: The Use of Philosophical Psychology in Trinitarian Theology among the Franciscans and Dominicans, 1250-1350*, vol. 1 (Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2013), 85-88. I discuss these two modes in more detail in Chapter Two below.

[36] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 8, resp. (5:114a). For this reason, I qualified my use of "realization" in the above paragraph. There is no reduction from potency to act: generation and spiration

This heterotelic and productive vibrancy reflects Bonaventure's theology of the good as self-diffusive. Like the actuality, fontality, and fecundity of *primitas*, the self-diffusive character of the good also manifests itself intrinsically via the two perfect modes of emanation. This aspect of the good emerges in Chapter Six of the *Itinerarium*,[37] where the Seraphic Doctor perhaps most eloquently expresses his theology of the good.[38] He explains that the purity of the good, "which is pure act," diffuses itself *per modum naturae et voluntatis*.[39] This diffusion thereby results in *summam communicabilitatem*, *summam consubstantialitatem*, *summam configurabilitatem*, *summam coaequalitatem*, *summam coaeternitatem*, and *summam cointimitatem*, "by which one is in the other necessarily through supreme circumincession (*per summam circumincessionem*)."[40] Even if it might be too precipitous a conclusion to identify the good with *primitas*, at

---

are *co-eternal. Primitas* is eternally manifested and expressed; it does not come to actuality, but is eternally actual. My use of "realization" is not meant to connote any sort of potentiality and subsequent actuality.

[37] See also *Hex.*, 11.11 (5:381b-382a).

[38] See Ciampanelli, *Hominem reducere ad Deum*, 77.

[39] The *Summa Halensis* also appeals to these two modes to explain the self-diffusive character of goodness (see *SH* I, n. 317, resp. [1:465b-466a]; as well as Section 1.2 in the following chapter). Bonaventure thus follows the *Summa Halensis* in that the self-diffusive character of goodness is descriptive of the Trinity not only *ad extra* but *ad intra*, as Boyd Taylor Coolman has noted in his "The Comprehensive Trinitarianism of the *Summa Halensis*," in *The Summa Halensis: Doctrines and Debates*, 107-139 at 121. Cf. Mathieu, *La Trinità creatrice*, 33-38; Alejandro de Villalmonte, "El argumento 'Ex caritate' en la doctrina trinitaria de san Buenaventura," *Revista Española de Teología* 13 (1953): 521-547 at 526-528. The notion of the good as self-diffusive emerges out of the Platonic tradition and finds its first Christian expression in Pseudo-Dionysius. In Pseudo-Dionysius, however, the metaphysics of the good does not explain the plurality of persons in God, but rather creation *ad extra*. Furthermore, for Plotinus, the One, even if described as good, "is good not for itself but for the others" (*Ennead*, VI.9.6, trans. A. H. Armstrong, Loeb Classical Library 468 [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1988], 327). In the Middle Ages, Christian reflection will locate the diffusive character of the good in the divine life (see Villamonte, "El argumento 'Ex caritate,'" 529-531).

[40] *Itin.*, 6.2 (5:311a). The doctrine of Trinitarian *circumincessio* (from the Greek *perichoresis*) comes from John Damascene, who used it to explain the way in which the divine persons are mutually in one another. For Bonaventure's theology of *circumincessio*, see Mary Melone, "Circumincessio," in *Dizionario Bonaventuriano*, 230-231; Luc Mathieu, "Circumincessio," in *Lexique Saint Bonaventure*, 33-34; Oltra, "La santisima Trinidad," 43-46. Interestingly, St. Thomas Aquinas does not utilize the term. Regarding the theology of *circumincessio/perichoresis* in general, see Verna Harrison, "Perichoresis in the Greek Fathers," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 35 (1991): 53-65; and Angust Deneffe, "Perichoresis, circumincessio, circuminsessio" *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 47 (1923): 497-532. For a study more specific to the Damascene, see Charles Twombly, *Perichoresis and Personhood: God, Christ, and Salvation in John of Damascus* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2015). See my comments under Section 2.3 in the following chapter.

the very least the two concepts convey something similar.[41] *Primitas* designates the Father as the principle source of divine life, the fontal plenitude of diffusive goodness.

For Bonaventure, then, it is not the divine essence abstracted from the persons that constitutes their primitive ground. Accordingly, as alluded to above, the impersonal neoplatonic understanding of the good as self-diffusive finds here a personalist reconfiguration in the Father, who is the source from whom the second and third persons emanate by way of nature and of will. The diffusion of the highest good *per modum naturae et voluntatis* is precisely how the Father's primordial fontality manifests itself.[42]

Accordingly, for Bonaventure, *potentia generandi* indicates "fecundity for the act of generation."[43] And this fecundity is proper to the Father. The act of generation is not, therefore, consequent to the nature *simpliciter*, but rather to the nature *ut in persona*.[44] There is a certain power—"the fecundity of power"[45]—that maps on to the first person's innascibility and hence fontality. "Ergo prima, ideo potentissima."[46] Within this framework, moreover, omnipotence is thereby coherently appropriated to the Father: "because from the first and highest principle flows all *posse*."[47]

---

[41] Cf. Ciampanelli, *Hominem reducere ad Deum*, 76; Mathieu, "Introduction," 13. Note also the lexical similarity between *Itin.* 6.2 (*actualis, intrinseca, per modum Verbi, per modum Doni, summam consubstantialitatem, coaequalitatem, coaeternitatem*) and the passage from the *Myst. Trin.* q. 8, resp. above at n35 (*actualitatem, duos modos intrinsecos, per modum verbi et amoris, tres hypostases coaequales, coaeternales et consubstantiales*).

[42] Ilia Delio, in her "Bonaventure's Metaphysics of the Good," *Theological Studies* 60 (1999): 228-246, interprets the Father's self-diffusive goodness as kenotic: "The self-donation of the Father can be described as kenotic since that which constitutes the Father, the fecundity of the good, is given to an other by the very nature of the good" (236-237). I do not think *kenosis*, however, is fitting. Above all, it is not clear to me exactly what is meant by *kenosis*: precisely what does it bring to the table? It is not the case, for example, that the *fons* is no longer full. What would it mean for fontal fullness to be emptied? In addition, Bonaventure's language indicates not self-emptying but excessive—indeed, infinitely infinite—productivity and fecundity. See, for example, the use of superlatives in *Myst. Trin.*, q. 8, resp. (5:114a).

[43] *I Sent.*, d. 7, au., q. 1, resp. (1:136a). See also *I Sent.*, d. 7, au., q. 2, resp. (1:139a-140a).

[44] *I Sent.*, d. 7, dub. 5 (1:145ab). See also *I Sent.*, d. 19, p. 1, au., q. 2, ad 3 (1:345b).

[45] *II Sent.*, praelocutio (2:2b). See Stohr, *Trinitätslehre*, 133: "Als Prinzip der Zeugung kommt der Vaterschaft eine Art Potenzencharakter zu (potentia generandi)."

[46] *Hex.*, 12.10 (5:386a); see also *Hex.*, 3.4 (5:343b-344a).

[47] *Brev.*, 1.6.5 (5:215b). See Mathieu, *La Trinità creatrice*, 67-72; Woźniak, *Primitas et plenitudo*, 144-145.

Such power is ultimately infinite. Indeed, Bonaventure will say that the Father gives his "total infinity" to the Son,[48] and that the Father diffuses himself "secundum totum posse."[49] This power is infinite because the Divine Being is infinite. This infinity is actual infinity and so is found in God alone who is "pure act" and "most perfect."[50] The metaphysics of pure act (pure goodness), as well as Bonaventure's understanding of perfection, both entail the intrinsic communicability of divine life—the plurality of persons. Infinite, then, is God's life: infinite is the ordered and eternal springing forth of the Word and of Love from the Father of lights.

2. Three is the Number of Infinity

In the previous section, I offered a basic overview of Bonaventure's teaching on *primitas*. This term, which grants positive meaning to the Father's sourcelessness, posits supreme actuality, fontality, and fecundity in God. The Father, as *primum*, is the origin—i.e., *principium*—of the second and third divine persons. Accordingly, the primacy of the Father grounds the self-diffusive goodness of divine life as a whole. This *actualis* and *intrinseca* diffusion of the good takes place per the two perfect modes of personal emanation: *per modum naturae* and *per modum voluntatis*.

Significantly, moreover, creation alone cannot satisfy the exigencies of the "immensity (*immensitas*) of eternal goodness."[51] "The goodness of a creature adds nothing to the goodness of the Creator, because the finite adds nothing to the infinite."[52] Creation cannot fully express divine goodness because only the pure act of pure goodness is infinite. Bonaventure's metaphysics of the good thus correlates with his metaphysics of divine infinity: both entail trinitarian plurality. Therefore, only the actual generation of the Son and spiration of the Spirit suffice to account for and manifest completely the ontology of the *summum bonum*. The locus of infinite goodness lies in the mystery of the Father's fecundity, and thus in the

---

[48] *I Sent.*, d. 7, au., q. 2, resp. (1:140a).
[49] *Hex.*, 11.11 (5:382a).
[50] *I Sent.*, d. 43, au., q. 1, ad 3 (1:767a).
[51] *Itin.*, 6.2 (5:310b).
[52] *Hex.*, 11.11 (5:382a).

perichoretic life of the Triune God. In a word, divine infinity is isomorphic with the mystery of God's intrinsic and actual plurality. "Nothing is called immense (*immensum*), except that which possesses the highest and most perfect actuality (*summam et perfectissimam actualitatem*)."[53]

The intrinsic order of divine life, springing forth from the *primitas* of the Father, is infinite. It is not infinite in the quantitative number of persons, but in its actuality, goodness, love. *Primitas* is the source of God's infinite life; *primitas* realizes itself infinitely in three persons.

I turn now, then, to Bonaventure's doctrine of divine infinity. To do this, I focus primarily on his magisterial treatment of the attribute in the *De mysterio Trinitatis* (q. 4).[54]

2.1 *De mysterio Trinitatis, q. 4, a. 1*

I begin with article one: *Utrum divinum esse sit infinitissimum*.[55] In his response, Bonaventure—true to his scholastic formation—begins with

---

[53] *I Sent*., d. 43, au., q. 2, ad 6 (1:770b). Regarding *summa actualitas*, see also *Myst. Trin.*, q. 6, a. 2, resp. (5:104b): "Furthermore, since actual (*actualis*) immutability together with the highest simplicity and eternity posits the highest actuality (*summam actualitatem*), and the highest actuality is through [being's] full conversion over itself in knowing and in loving, and the intellect includes a word, and love includes a *nexum*; [and] just as it is not only not repugnant to, but rather harmonious with the immutability of the First Principle that it know and love itself, so it is also harmonious that it generate a Word and spirate Love. For each is fitting to him [the First Principle] immutably and always in act." Cf. Hayes, "Introduction," 97.

[54] Most helpful in this regard is Goff, *Caritas in Primo*, 251-263; *Idem*, "Divine Infinity in Bonaventure's *Disputed Questions on the Mystery of the Trinity*." See also Hayes' "Introduction," 87-91; Oltra, "La santisima Trinidad," 39-40. While all of the attributes treated in the *Myst. Trin.* (unity, simplicity, infinity, eternity, immutability, and necessity) entail the trinity of persons, I have chosen to focus here on infinity because of its relation to power (infinite power) and, as will be made clearer, to the Father. Theologically, moreover, Bonaventure's treatment of infinity is not only interesting in its own right, but historically important. He both advances the preceding Franciscan tradition (as articulated, e.g., in the *Summa Halensis*, which wants to say something positive about the meaning of divine infinity) and also anticipates Scotus' teaching about intensive infinity. Regarding the *Summa Halensis*, see Meldon Wass, *The Infinite God and the Summa Fratris Alexandri* (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1964), Tiziana Suarez-Nani, "On Divine Immensity and Infinity in Relation to Space and Time: The Crossroad of the *Summa Halensis*," in *The Legacy of Early Franciscan Thought*, 71-87. For Scotus, in addition to Goff's work, see Francis Catania, "John Duns Scotus on *Ens Infinitum*," *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 67 (1993): 37-54.

[55] Bonaventure anticipates his treatment of infinity already in question 3 on divine simplicity, wherein he identifies the Divine Being with a triple formula: "infinitum divinum esse est infinitissime infinitum" (*Myst. Trin.*, q. 3, a. 2, ad 13 [5:73b]; see also q. 3, a. 1, resp. [5:70b]). On the important link between simplicity and infinity, see the presentation in Goff, *Caritas in Primo*, 229-247 (especially n96-97 at 230-231).

distinctions. Infinity is said either *privative* or *negative*. Understood privatively, infinity means the privation of act. Privative infinity thereby designates a state of incompletion. Obviously, this kind of infinity does not characterize the divine being. "Only limited beings," comments Goff, "manifest this sort of infinity. Because God is simply first, he is superlatively or maximally *in himself* (*in se ipso*) or simple."[56]

Understood negatively, infinity negates finality. To be infinite in this way is to lack an end (*finis*). This kind of infinity Bonaventure further divides according to two ways of understanding *finis*: "end as a term-limit" (*finis-terminus*) or "end as completion" (*finis-complementum*).[57] Accordingly, infinity refers either to the negation of an "end as completion, and thus evil is said to be infinite," or to the negation of "end as term-limit."[58] Obviously, insofar as infinity expresses the negation of an "end as completion," it does not befit God who is pure act.

So what about infinity as the negation of an "end as term-limit"? To grasp this kind of infinity, Bonaventure, following Augustine, introduces yet another distinction: *terminus secundum quantitatem materialem* (i.e., *quantitas molis*) and *terminus secundum quantitatem spiritualem* (i.e., *quantitas virtutis*). With respect to the former, Bonaventure explains:

> Infinity, therefore, by way of negation of a term-limit regarding material quantity always bespeaks some incompletion in some way, either in act, or in potency, because it indicates a departure from simplicity.[59]

This kind of infinity is never fully in act; it is only potential.[60] It cannot, therefore, befit God. Bonaventure thereby insinuates what he is after: a theory of divine infinity fully in act—not potentially infinite, but actually infinite.

The analysis now turns to infinity as the negation of a term-limit *circa quantitatem virtutis*. Conceptually understood as such, infinity does not involve imperfection, but rather entails the "highest perfection, because it is

---

[56] Goff, "Divine Infinity," 171 (emphasis in original).
[57] I am here using Goff's translation of these terms.
[58] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 4, a. 1, resp. (5:81a).
[59] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 4, a. 1, resp. (5:81a).
[60] "And such infinity is never in act, but only in potency (*nunquam est actu, sed solum potentia*), in act however it is finite." *Myst. Trin.*, q. 4, a. 1, resp. (5:81a).

not repugnant to simplicity; indeed it is not able to be except *in summe simplici*."[61] Bonaventure can make this connection in part because of how his argument has already developed in the previous question on simplicity (q. 3): in brief, what is most perfect is most simple, and what is most simple is most powerful.[62] Ultimately, Bonaventure's theology of simplicity is part and parcel to his treatment of infinity. Supreme simplicity, which implies *summam potentiam et virtutem*, thus entails "perfect communication and production"—the Trinity.[63] Simplicity is the metaphysical condition for the kind of intrinsic communication that takes place in God.[64] Infinite is what that communication *is*.

The reference to perfection and simplicity thus effectively coordinates divine infinity with the intrinsic communicability of divine life.[65] Bonaventure, in other words, infuses the concept of infinity with heterological inclination. In fact, as will become clearer, infinity is inseparable from the perichoretic mystery of the Holy Trinity. God is infinite only if God is three.

It would be helpful to depart for a moment from the *De mysterio Trinitatis*, and consider momentarily a passage from the *Hexaemeron*, where the link between simplicity and infinity also surfaces. In this passage, Bonaventure discusses the First Cause, and remarks that the First is not only *potentissima*—and so can do many things—but also *actualissima*. It is most actual, however, *secundum actum intrinsecum* (= emanation). He concludes:

> This cause, because it is one, is supremely simple (*summe simplex*); and because it is supremely simple, it is infinite, because "a power (*virtus*)

---

[61] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 4, a. 1, resp. (5:81a).

[62] See my comments under Section 2.2 below, especially n75-78.

[63] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 3, a. 2, fund. 7 (5:75a).

[64] See Sergio Bonanni, "*Generatio est ratio communicandi essentiam*: La teologia trinitaria di Bonaventura da Bagnoregio alla luce del suo commento alla V *distinctio* del I *Sententiarum* di Pietro Lombardo," in *Deus summe cognoscibilis: The Current Theological Relevance of Saint Bonaventure*, eds. Amaury Begasse de Dhaem et al. (Leuven – Paris – Bristol: Peeters, 2018), 571-590. Bonanni articulates well the importance of simplicity: "L'essenza divina, proprio per la sua semplicità, è comunicabile più di ogni altra ed è di fatto comunicata in forza di ciò che in essa moltiplica i suppositi" (576). See also Clifton Stringer, "Supremely Simple Trinity and Contemporary 'Natural Theology': Bonaventure Beyond Jenson and Plotinus," *Pro Ecclesia: A Journal of Catholic and Evangelical Theology*, OnlineFirst, November 30, 2022.

[65] In addition to Bonaventure's treatment of simplicity in *Myst. Trin.* q. 3, see q. 7, resp. (5:114a), where Bonaventure affirms that *summa perfectio* entails the two perfect modes of emanation, see also *I Sent.*, d. 2, au., q. 2 (1:53-54) where he explains the plurality of divine persons in terms of *summa perfectio* and *summa simplicitas*; see also *I Sent.*, d. 2, au., q. 4 (1:56-58); *Hex.*, 11.6-7 (5:381a). That which is most complete is most communicative.

or a cause, however much it is unified and simple, that much more is it infinite (*quanto magis unita et simplex, tanto magis infinita*)," not indeed by an extension of mass (*distensione molis*), but of power (*virtutis*).[66]

Bonaventure thus establishes a correspondence between the intrinsic actuality of God's life and God's life as supremely simple and infinite.

I return to the argument of the *De mysterio Trinitatis*. Having fastened infinity to simplicity, Bonaventure then refers—as in the passage from the *Hexaemeron* above—once again to the principle from the *Liber de Causis*:

> For because [the Divine Being] is *summe simplex*, it is therefore supremely united *in se* and in its power (*posse*); and because supremely united *in se*, there is thereby nothing that contracts it (*nihil habet contrahens*), nothing that limits it, nothing that determines it and nothing that puts it in a genus, and for this reason it is beyond and above all things. Furthermore, because it is most unified in its power (*unitissimum respectu posse*), then *esse et posse* are the same in it, and therefore, wherever is its *esse*, there is its power; and where is its *esse*, there is the center and origin and fount of its power; and where is the fount and origin and center of its power, it can always do more …. This agrees with the *Liber de Causis*: "Every power the more unified it is, is more infinite (*Omnis virtus unita plus est infinita*)."[67]

This passage brings infinity into direct contact with the previous two questions from the *De mysterio Trinitatis*: q. 2 asks about unity and q. 3 asks about simplicity. By dint of divine simplicity and unity—as well as recourse to the logic of the *Liber de Causis*[68]—the divine being is infinite. Divine infinity abnegates any term-limit to divine power.

Yet, as Goff notes, the precise content or concept of divine power here remains "opaque."[69] Bonaventure wants to get at a notion of divine infinity that is fully in act, but it is not yet clear precisely how infinite power is realized *in actu*. Notwithstanding the fact that, in the above passage, Bonaventure certainly wants to link up infinity with the divine *esse*,[70] it

---

[66] *Hex.*, 12.10 (5:386a).
[67] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 4, a. 1, resp. (5:81ab).
[68] See n85 below.
[69] *Caritas in Primo*, 257.
[70] See also how Bonaventure ends his response: "It should be conceded, therefore, that not only the divine power, but also the divine being is infinite." *Myst. Trin.*, q. 4, a. 1, resp. (5:82a).

appears that the divine power is infinitely expressive but only in a potential way: "it can always do more." The Seraphic Doctor, however, has only partially completed his treatment of divine infinity. To get to the heart of his doctrine on this point, we must look to article 2 and consider not just the *esse divinum* but the *esse divinum et trinum*.

Let us not leave article 1 just yet, though. There is one more element of his response I should like to address. Having just argued that the divine being is infinite because he is *summe simplex*, Bonaventure now argues that the divine being is infinite because he is *simpliciter summum*: "quia simpliciter summum, necesse est esse omnino immensum."[71] In the course of his argument, Bonaventure refers to infinite nobility and goodness: God must have "*in se* infinite nobility and goodness."[72] Taken in a finite mode, goodness can always be multiplied and so cannot befit God, about whom nothing better can be thought. Bonaventure's appeal to goodness establishes an implicit connection to the *Itinerarium*'s reference to the "immensity of eternal goodness."[73] In the *Itinerarium*, the actuality of infinite goodness ultimately lies in the diffusion *per modum naturae et voluntatis* of the divine life, which in turn reveals infinite goodness. Consequently, in the *De mysterio Trinitatis*, when Bonaventure speaks of infinite goodness, he is, even if only cryptically, preparing his reader for article 2, which will describe divine infinity precisely in terms of the emanation of the second and third divine person.

2.2 *De mysterio Trinitatis, q. 4, a. 2*

Bonaventure begins article two with the opposing arguments. In brief, they deny that infinity can apply to the Trinity, because it would imply a numerical infinity of divine persons. Not surprisingly, then, the heart of Bonaventure's response locates infinity not in numerical quantity. Infinity rather lies in the actuality of divine life itself. One might say that three is the

---

[71] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 4, a. 1, resp. (5:81a).
[72] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 4, a. 1, resp. (5:81b).
[73] *Itin.*, 6.2 (5:310b); see n51 above.

most actual number of infinity. If the Divine Being is infinite, the Divine Being is three—not in essence, but in persons.

Bonaventure's response consists of three principal arguments. There is no need here to analyze all three. It will suffice to take into account only the first. In this argument, Bonaventure asserts that, when speaking about God, infinity indicates not a "defect (*defectum*)," but an "excess (*excessus*)." This assertion follows the logic already developed in the prior article. He specifies that this "excess" is "not [an excess] of superfluity, but of perfection and nobility."[74]

God is infinite because he is excessively perfect. By tethering infinity to what I would call his metaphysics of perfection, Bonaventure can infer the relationship between infinity and emanation. For the Seraphic Doctor, that is, perfection entails intrinsic communicativity. In a word, to God is attributed every perfection; he is *perfectissimum*.[75] And what is most perfect is most simple.[76] That which is most simple is most powerful and most united.[77] Therefore, the most simple being includes *summa potentiam et virtutem*, "because … to the degree that some power is more united, to that degree is it more infinite (*quanto aliqua virtus magis est, tanto magis est infinita*); but the supreme and most actual power grants supreme and most perfect communication and production, and this posits a trinity."[78]

Ultimately, then, Bonaventure can make explicit what was so implicit in the previous article: "Because therefore infinity in God ... posits *summam perfectionem*, it thus follows that, in the emanation of the divine persons, it is to be affirmed immensity (*immensitatem*) regarding the one producing, the one produced, and the mode of producing."[79]

Consequently, infinity has nothing to do with a numerical infinity of persons. Numerical infinity would lead to defect or superfluity. Rather, it is the trinitarian life itself that reveals infinity. Bonaventure continues:

---

[74] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 4, a. 2, resp. (5:85b).
[75] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 3, a. 1, resp. (5:70b).
[76] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 3, a. 1, fund. 8 and resp. (5:69a and 70b);
[77] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 3, a. 1, fund. 6 (5:68b-69a); q. 4, a. 1, resp. (5:81b).
[78] *Myst. Trin.* q. 3, a. 2, fund. 7 (5:75a).
[79] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 4, a. 2, resp. (5:85b).

For since there are two noble modes of emanating, *per modum naturae et per modum liberalitatis*, the two persons which emanate according to these modes either do not possess (*caperent*) the whole immensity of the power of the one producing (= the Father), and thus would be imperfect; or, if they possess it, others would be superfluous. But in the Divine Being, since it is immense, it is impossible that there be something superfluous or diminishing: it is necessary to posit that God is triune and immense.[80]

In this passage, Bonaventure locates the infinity of power (*immensitatem virtutis*) in the Father, the source of the two emanations.[81]

To posit a numerical infinity thus completely misses the point. The infinity of power, which emerged in the first article, is realized not on account of an infinite number of emanations, but on account of the Father's generation of the Son and spiration of the Spirit. To echo Peter Fehlner: "There is no other procession because there is no other mode of procession except one which is natural and one which is voluntary. Each is infinitely exhausted once."[82] That there is emanation only according to these two modes does not indicate a defect, "but rather completion: because in those two productions, productive power (*virtus*) manifests itself most perfectly and infinitely, both with regards to the immensity of the persons produced, and with regards to the actuality of the productions themselves."[83]

The Father's productive *virtus* is infinite and manifests itself infinitely by way of the fecund emanation of the Son and the Spirit. Herein is the actuality of divine infinity. God is infinite being in the very precise sense that God is three.[84]

---

[80] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 4, a. 2, resp. (5:85b).

[81] At *Hex.*, 3.4 (5:343b), Bonaventure speaks explicitly about the Father's infinite power: "since [the Word] represents the power of the Father, he represents power that is most united (*unitissimam*); but 'power, the more it is united, the more it is infinite' (*virtus, quanto magis unita, tanto magis infinita*)."

[82] Fehlner, *The Role of Charity in the Ecclesiology of St. Bonaventure* (Rome: Miscellanea Francescana, 1965), 107.

[83] *Myst. Trin*., q. 4, a. 2, ad 4 (5:86b).

[84] With Goff (*Caritas in Primo*, 256-257), I therefore disagree with Leo Sweeney's analysis of infinity in Bonaventure. In his "Bonaventure and Aquinas on the Divine Being as Infinite," in *Bonaventure and Aquinas: Enduring Philosophers*, eds. Robert Shahan and Francis Kovach (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1976), 134-153 at 148, Sweeney concludes: "Infinity ... [for Bonaventure] describes the divine essence with reference to creatures rather than directly in itself." That is simply not accurate.

The infinite life of the Triune God thereby ultimately emerges as the logical consequence of the *primitas* of the *primum*.[85] Once again, Bonaventure's theology is extremely personalistic: divine infinity is rooted, in the final analysis, in the fontal fullness of the Father. Indeed, it is in the two emanating persons that the "immensity of the fontal productive power shines forth (*relucet*)."[86] Goff writes well:

> The radical infinity of the divine being is rooted in the Father as *innascibilitas* and *fontalis plenitudo*. In this manner Bonaventure reduces the radical-fundamental infinity of the divine being ... to the person of the Father who is in every sense *a se* and thus radically *primum* and *primitas*.[87]

2.3 *Divine Infinity and the Holy Spirit*

To draw this section to a close, I reflect on Bonaventure's theology of infinity in terms of the Holy Spirit. I turn first to *Myst. Trin.*, q. 4, a. 2, fund. 1. Therein, Bonaventure asserts that "*summa immensitas* does not take anything away from the supreme perfection of the power of the one producing (*virtutis producentis*)."[88] The perfection of power, however, requires that there be a *status*, i.e., a terminal point. If there were a numerical infinity, there could be no *status*. There would thus be no order. Hence the infinity of the Divine Being does not imply an infinity of persons. As used here, *status* constitutes an implicit reference to the Holy Spirit—the *ultimum* of the perfect

---

[85] In this respect, Bonaventure's use of the *Liber de Causis*, is quite revelatory. In synthesis, at *Myst. Trin.*, q. 3, a. 2, fund. 7 (5:75a), Bonaventure affirmed that "supreme simplicity … includes supreme *potentiam et virtutem*, because *quanto aliqua virtus magis est unita, tanto magis est infinita*; but the supreme and most actual power grants supreme and most perfect communication and production, and this posits a trinity." See also *Myst. Trin.*, q. 3, a. 1, fund. 6 (5:68b-69a). Then, at q. 8, fund. 2 (5:113a): "Again, *quanto aliquid prius, tanto potentius et actualius*. Therefore, the First Principle was necessarily most actual and most powerful; but the act of the First Principle is … to-be-principle (*principiare*); therefore if in the First Principle, for the very reason that it is first, it is necessarily posited the reason (*ratio*) of supreme actuality and power (*ratio summae actualitatis et potentiae*), then it is necessarily granted the truth of eternal production, and through this the completion of the perfect trinity (*completio trinitatis perfectae*)." The Father, who is *primum*, the fontal source of the Trinity, and to whom is attributed unity, is infinitely powerful and actual: thus, the infinite actuality of the eternal productions bursts forth from *primitas*. Per this neoplatonic principle, Bonaventure sustains that if God is one, then God is more than one. He can make this conclusion thanks to the fecundity of the First Principle in itself.

[86] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 4, a. 2, ad 7 (5:86b).

[87] Goff, "Divine Infinity," 184.

[88] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 4, a. 2, fund. 1 (5:84b)

order of the Trinity.[89] The Father's infinite fontality finds its terminal point in the *status* that is the Spirit.

Bonaventure makes a similar point in *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 2. This question asks if there is a person who proceeds through the mode of love in God. One of the opposing arguments denies such a procession because it would lead to an infinite series. It argues that if there is an emanation through the mode of love because the Father loves the Son, then we should posit another emanation through love because the Son also loves the Spirit. An infinite series of such emanations seems unavoidable. As part of his response to this argument, Bonaventure remarks that "there is a terminal point (*status*) at the first love [i.e., the Spirit]."[90] "The procession of the Holy Spirit," writes Fehlner, "completes the exigences of divine love."[91]

Furthermore, the concept of *status* also plays a part in Bonaventure's treatment of divine infinity at *I Sent.*, d. 43. In the course of his treatment therein, he responds to an opposing argument, which concluded that God is not infinite because nothing infinite completes anything (*nullum infinitum finit aliud*). So if God is infinite, then he is the *finis* of nothing.[92] To respond, Bonaventure distinguishes between infinity *per privationem perfectionis* and infinity *per negationem limitationis*. The former sense cannot provide an end

---

[89] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 4, a. 2, fund. 2 (5:84b).

[90] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 2, ad 3 (1:198b). *Nota bene*: In Bonaventure's corpus, *status* does not unqualifiedly or determinately refer to the Spirit. It can also, for example, simply mean its English counterpart "status." Otherwise, the term—as far as I can tell—has to do with order. For instance, it is in this way that *status* plays an important role in Bonaventure's *Breviloquium*, as Joshua Benson's important study ("The Christology of the *Breviloquium*") has revealed. Benson explicates the structure of the *Breviloquium* by utilizing the categories of *ortus*, *progressus/modus*, and *status/fructus*, which he gleans from the prologue of the *Breviloquium*, wherein Bonaventure distinguishes between the *ortus*, *progressus*, and *status/fructus* of Sacred Scripture. Furthermore, connoting structure or order, *status* can thus have different references depending on the context. It can, for example, refer to the Father. This is because the *primum* also functions as *status*. There is nothing prior to the *primum*, and so there is *status* at the first. As absolutely *a se*, there is nothing prior to the Father and so he is the fount of divine life. As fount, he is also *status* in that the divine life—like an intelligible circle—returns to the Father (see, for example, *I Sent.*, d. 2, au., q. 2, ad 4 [1:54b]; *I Sent.*, d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 2, ad 3 [1:471b]; *I Sent.*, d. 45, a. 2, q. 1, resp. [1:804b-805a]; *Myst. Trin.*, q. 2, a. 2, ad 17 [5:67b]; *Myst. Trin.*, q. 3, a. 1, resp. [5:70b]; Hellmann, *Divine and Created Order*, 38-40; Woźniak, *Primitas et plenitudo*, 199-204). The divine life, indeed ultimately all existence, springs forth from the Father and returns to the Father (see *I Sent.*, d. 31, p. 2, dub. 7 [1:552a]; Villalmonte, "El Padre plenitud fontal," 241). Lastly, Bonaventure will also refer to the Holy Trinity, insofar as the Trinity is First Principle (*primum*) in the vertical order of essences, as *status* (*Myst. Trin.*, q. 7, resp. [1:114b]).

[91] Fehlner, *The Role of Charity*, 108. See also Hayes, "Introduction," 100; Hellmann, *Divine and Created Order*, 78-80.

[92] *I Sent.*, d. 43, au., q. 2, opp. 4 (1:769a).

because it lacks completion and perfection; the latter, however, speaks to the limitless immensity of perfection that does befit God. Accordingly, the opposing argument works only in the case of the former. Infinity *per negationem limitationis*, however, "has *rationem finiendi*, because since it is the highest, in it is every *status*: for in this, infinity is repugnant neither to simplicity nor to completion (*complemento*)."[93]

Although he does not say it there, for Bonaventure, the Spirit is *ratio finiendi*—the *ratio terminantis complementi* of the divine persons.[94] One might say, then, that divine infinity begins in the Father and culminates in the Spirit.[95] Divine infinity is not disordered, chaotic incompletion. It is rather about the Trinity's absolute and excessive perfection. As such, the Spirit is the loving coeternal culmination (*status*) of the life of the infinite God that begins in the first beginning, the Father.

3. Conclusion: The *Primum* and the *Ultimum*

3.1 *The Father's Fontality and the Spirit*

As this chapter has emphasized, the Father's innascibility entails fontal fullness. Being *a nullo*, the Father is utterly, indeed infinitely, fontal. This fontality cannot, therefore, only refer to the Father's generation of the Son. It refers also to the spiration of the Spirit.[96] As Bonaventure puts it, even though the Father gives everything to the Son, his fontality is not exhausted, because "he does not give in every way that he can."[97]

Accordingly, there is no actual fontal fullness without the breathing forth of Love. The Father's generation of the Word is inseparable from and

---

[93] *I Sent.*, d. 43, au., q. 2, ad 4 (1:770b).

[94] *Brev.*, 1.6.4 (5:215b) and *Hex.*, 1.12 (5:331b). See also *Hex.*, 21.4 (5:432a): "finale complementum."

[95] See *Hex.*, 8.12 (5:371a), where Bonaventure, in effect, argues that infinity requires the Holy Spirit.

[96] See *I Sent.*, d. 28, au., q. 2, resp. (1:500a)—see n20 above.

[97] *I Sent.*, d. 2, au., q. 4, ad 1 (1:58a). Hence, the term *principium*—predicated of the Father—refers both to paternity *and* spiration commonly; see *I Sent.*, d. 29, dub. 1 (1:516a-517a).

thus accompanied by the breath of love.[98] For the Seraphic Doctor, the generation of the Son is *concomitant* with the procession of the Spirit, whose procession *per modum amoris* is equally *concomitant* with the Son's procession *per modum naturae*.[99] The two fontal emanations are thus *naturaliter coannexae*: the generation of the Word in no way impedes the "spiration of love embracing both."[100]

For Bonaventure, then, the Son cannot be generated without being loved: hence the Son is connected (*connexum*) to the lover.[101] He is connected because the *nexus* that is the Spirit brings distinction into final unity.[102] "The procession of the Word," so concludes Fehlner, "is incomprehensible except insofar as it is completed in a procession of love."[103] I think here of a pertinent passage from Etienne Vetö's recent work on the Holy Spirit. Although not writing from a bonaventurean perspective, his words correspond well to the Seraphic Doctor's theology developed thus far:

> The spiration of the Spirit by the Father, coeternal with the act of generating the Son, can be thought of as contributing to the generation and as an intrinsic part of it. The Breath does not "quicken" the Son, but the breathing out of the Breath by the Father "completes" the generation of the Son.[104]

To understand who the Father is, theology must consider not only his perfect Image, but the mutual Love that binds the Father and the Son. An eternal breath of embracing Love lies at the very innascibile source of all that is.

3.2 *The Father as Primum*

---

[98] "For since [God] is spirit and intellect, he cannot lack a begotten word and love proceeding (*verbo genito et amore processivo*)." *Myst. Trin.*, q. 1, a. 2, resp. (5:55a).

[99] *I Sent.*, d. 6, au., q. 2, resp. (1:128a). See Section 2 in the following chapter.

[100] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 5, a. 2, ad 9 (5:96ab).

[101] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 5, a. 2, fund. 2 (5:94a).

[102] See, for example, *I Sent.*, d. 11, au., q. 2, ad 2 (1:216a). A more detailed explication of the Spirit will obviously follow below in Chapter Three.

[103] Fehlner, *The Role of Charity*, 104.

[104] Vetö, *The Breath of God: An Essay on the Holy Spirit in the Trinity* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2019), 66 (see also page 67).

The Father is fontal *principium* of divine life because he is *Primum*. He is *Primum*, moreover, because an *ordo personarum* constitutes the divine being. This perfect order of divine life consists of a *ratio principii*, *ratio medii*, and *ratio ultimi*.[105] In effect, the very mystery of who the Father is, then, remains incomplete without the third, the *ratio ultimi*. The ultimate reason, i.e. the pinnacle of divine life, lies in the Spirit. *Primitas* points to the finality of love. The Father's *primitas* does not isolate him, but indicates his total orientation toward the other.

Accordingly, the heterotelic pulse, which lies at the very innascibile source of divine life in the *Primum*, is thus directed toward infinite love, the *Ultimum*. To this degree, the *cointimitas* of the Holy Trinity's perichoretic life rests, in a special way, on the unitive hypostasis of the Holy Spirit. Divine order is—and is for the sake of—perichoretic love, itself inseperable from the *nexus* that is the embracing love of the Spirit.

3.3 *The Father's Infinite Life*

As discussed above, the infinite act of the Father does not lead to an infinite number of persons. Rather, there is *status* in the love of the Spirit.[106] Divine infinity finds its actual terminal point in the Spirit.

In the *Hexaemeron*, in fact, Bonaventure makes an almost explicit connection between infinity and the Spirit.

> The fourth diffusion is *per rationem dilectionis*. For it is necessary that, wherever there is beatitude, there is supreme love, and thus love in the highest degree. Now, there is reflexive love, connective love, and the love of charity. Connective love, by which I love the other, is more perfect than reflexive love, by which I love myself. But the love of charity is more perfect than each, because it involves a beloved and a co-beloved (*dilectum et condilectum*). Hence, this is [the kind of love] in God. By this love, therefore, the Father loves the Son, and there is infinite fire (*ardor*).[107]

---

[105] *Hex.*, 11.7 (5:381a)—see n27 above.
[106] See n90 and 93 above.
[107] *Hex.*, 11.12 (5:382a).

In this trenchant passage, the Seraphic Doctor identifies the love descriptive of the Holy Trinity as the love of charity.[108] This love includes, in addition to the one loving, a beloved *and* a co-beloved: the *condilectus*.[109] Reference to the *condilectus* is reference to the Spirit. Without the Spirit, God *is not* love in the highest degree.

The passage then concludes that in this love, by which the Father loves the Son, there is an infinite fire. This fire (*ardor*) is the Holy Spirit.[110] Bonaventure unveils the Spirit as the very infinite love of the infinite life of the Holy Trinity.

The Father's infinite self-diffusive goodness culminates in the pneumatic finality of the infinite love that brings the order of divine life to its perfect perichoretic completion: Love.

---

[108] In *Itin*., 6.2 (5:311a), Bonaventure uses the adverb *caritatevole* with respect to the emanations.

[109] The term *condilectus* comes from Richard of St. Victor; Bonaventure adopts the term and is clearly influenced by the Victorine's theology. See Mary Melone, "La recezione della teologia trinitaria di Riccardo di San Vittore nel *Commento alle Sentenze di Bonaventura da Bagnoregio*," in *Religioni et doctrinae. Miscellanea di studi offerti a Bernardino de Armellada in occasione del suo 80° compleanno*, ed. Aleksander Horowski (Roma: Istituto Storico dei Cappuccini, 2009), 141-174.

[110] See *Hex*., 20.10 (5:427a) and 21.2 (5:431ab).

CHAPTER TWO

The Son: *Ratio exprimendi et exemplandi*

In the previous chapter, I focused on the first person of the *ordo perfectus* of the Trinity. The Father, the innascibile source of the divinity, is infinitely fontal. Such fontality generates the Son, the second person of the *ordo perfectus*. "The perfect order of persons within God," writes Hellmann, "demands a second person standing in the middle place."[1] Hence the Son is the singular *medium*.[2] "Ubi est perfectus ordo, ibi est ratio principii, medii et ultimi."[3] The Father is origin, fontal principle; the Son is center, total mediation; the Spirit is culmination, ultimate finality.

As is well known, the centrality of Christ—*tenens medium in omnibus*[4]—is a leitmotif of Bonaventure's theological system.[5] He is the

---

[1] Hellmann, *Divine and Created Order*, 61.

[2] There cannot be multiple centers, otherwise there would be "infinite distance between the first and the last (*inter primam et ultimam*)" (*I Sent.*, d. 2, au., q. 3, fund. 3 [1:55a]). Implicit here is Bonaventure's understanding of *medium*, of what it means to be the center. Intimate relationality characterizes the Son's centrality, which would, in effect, collapse to the extent that the Spirit's finality loses its own place.

[3] *Hex.*, 11.7 (5:381a).

[4] *Hex.*, 1.10 (5:330b).

[5] This centrality does not only concern Christ within the order of salvation, but also the centrality of the Uncreated Word within the very mystery of divine life itself. For studies relevant to the centrality of Christ in Bonaventure, see: Dinh Anh Nhue Nguyen, "Il cristocentrismo, il fondamento 'totale' della teologia e la prospettiva sapienziale," in *Deus summe cognoscibilis*, 163-172; Robert Woźniak, "La teología de la mediación de Cristo en las obras sistemáticas de san Buenaventura," *Scripta theologica* 49 (2017): 327-349; Fabio Gambetti, "Cristo, centro della storia secondo san Bonaventura," *Doctor Seraphicus* 63 (2015): 129-158; Joshua Benson, "The Christology of the *Breviloquium*"; Giovanni Iammarrone, *La cristologia francescana: impulsi per il presente* (Padova: Messaggero di S. Antonio, 1997), 143-214; Hayes, *The Hidden Center*; *Idem*, "Christology and Metaphysics in the Thought of Bonaventure," *The Journal of Religion* 58, Supplement (1978): 82-96; Hellmann, *Divine and Created Order*, 61-77; Gabriele Panteghini, "Teologia del verbo o teologia dell'incarnazione: fondamenti e limiti del cristocentrismo bonaventuriano," in *Teologia e filosofia nel pensiero di S. Bonaventura. Contributi per una nuova interpretazione* (Brescia: Morcelliana, 1974), 9-54; Alexander Gerken, *Theologie des Wortes: Das Verhältnis von Schöpfung und Inkarnation bei Bonaventura* (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1963), especially 254-256 and 335-351; Alejandro de Villalmonte, "Orientación Cristocéntrica en la Teología de San Buenaventura," *Estudios Franciscanos* 59 (1958): 321-

center of the uncreated order of the Holy Trinity, as well as the very center of the economy of salvation and history itself. He is exemplar of the Trinity and exemplar of creation.[6] In this chapter, I focus on the centrality of the Son in the inner life of the Trinity.

More specifically, the scope of this chapter is to explicate the Son's centrality in view of the Holy Spirit. In a word, enfolded within the very identity of the Son *is* reference to the Spirit. The Son—beloved and thus *persona media*—implies the third divine person, without whom the Son *is not*. There is no beloved Son without the binding love of charity that is the Spirit.

To develop this theology of the second divine person, I divide this chapter into five sections. Section one is a prefatory reflection on Bonaventure's theology of generation. In the second section, I explicate the pneumatological nuances of the identity of the second divine person as "Word," "Image," and "Son." Section three then focuses on the interconnection between generation and spiration; this section highlights the relation between the generation of the Son and the spiration of the Holy Spirit. Section four discusses relevant aspects of Bonaventure's theology of the *filioque*. Lastly, the final section brings together into a synthesis the results of this chapter.

1. The Father Generates the Son

I divide this section into three subsections. The first subsection is introductory: it presents Bonaventure's generally Christocentric approach to the Holy Trinity, as articulated in a meditation from the *Breviloquium*. Subsection two consists of a brief presentation of the modes of emanations in the *Summa Halensis*. Then, the third subsection discusses basic contours of Bonaventure's theology of generation.

372; Werner Dettloff, "'Christus tenens medium in omnibus': Sinn und Funktion der Theologie bei Bonaventura," *Wissenschaft und Weisheit* 20 (1957): 28-42, 120-140. Regarding Bonaventure's theology of the Son within the inner life of God, see Hayes, "Introduction," 43-54; Stohr, *Trinitätslehre*, 137-148. This list is by no means exhaustive.

[6] See, e.g., *Apol. paup.*, 2.12 (8:242b).

1.1 *Introduction: A Christocentric Trinitarian Reflection*

In the *Breviloquium*'s opening treatment on the triune God, Bonaventure reflects on faith in God as Trinity. His reflection ultimately culminates in a Christocentric vision of the triune divinity. To begin his meditation, Bonaventure states that faith dictates that God is to be thought about *altissime et piissime*, that is, in the highest and in the most pious way.[7] He writes:

> We would not, however, think [about God] in the highest way (*altissime*) if we did not believe that God could supremely communicate himself; we would not think [about God] in the most pious way (*piissime*) if we believed that he could but did not will it; and therefore, so that we may think of God in the highest and most pious way, [faith] asserts that God supremely communicates himself eternally by having a beloved and a co-beloved (*dilectum et condilectum*), and for this reason God is one and three.[8]

Bonaventure then turns his attention specifically to the *dilectus*. He asserts that Scripture bears witness to this faith in terms of thinking about God in the most pious way (*piissime*). Scripture, that is, proclaims that God has an "offspring, which he supremely loves, a Word co-equal to himself."[9] Furthermore, both Scripture and creation bear witness to this faith in terms of thinking about God in the highest way (*altissime*). To develop this point, Bonaventure—drawing from Augustine—develops a list of 12 disjunctive properties to which creation attests. Then, from these 12, he arrives at three divine attributes: eternity, wisdom and beatitude.[10] These three implicitly refer, as appropriations, to the three divine persons.[11] Bonaventure is not done, though. He reduces these three to just one: wisdom.

---

[7] *Brev.*, 1.2.3 (5:211a). See also *Myst. Trin.*, q. 1, a. 2, resp. (5:55b-56a); *Hex.*, 9.24-26 (5:376a).

[8] *Brev.*, 1.2.3 (5:211a).

[9] *Brev.*, 1.2.4 (5:211a).

[10] The 12 disjunctives are: living/non-living, sentient/non-sentient, intelligent/non-intelligent, immortal/mortal, powerful/powerless, just/unjust, beautiful/ugly, good/bad, incorruptible/corruptible, immutable/mutable, invisible/visible, incorporeal/corporeal, happy/unhappy. From these 12 disjunctives, Augustine devises a list of 12 divine attributes, which Bonaventure then reduces to 3. See Goff, "Part I: 'On the Trinity of God,'" 107-111.

[11] As Goff ("Part I: 'On the Trinity of God,'" 110) observes, by reducing these 12 attributes of the divine being to three, Bonaventure "seeks to explain how the qualities of God ... reduce to a Trinitarian dynamic and order."

At this point, the analysis becomes Christocentric. The mystery of wisdom—appropriation of the second and middle person—unveils the whole Trinity.[12] In Bonaventure's own words: "and these three [are reduced] to one, namely to wisdom, in which is included a generating mind [= the Father], the Word as offspring, and love [= the Holy Spirit] connecting them both (*amor nectens utrumque*)."[13] Therefore, from the center Bonaventure unravels the Trinity: the center contains and reveals the whole emanational dynamic and structure of triune life.

This center—the *persona media*[14]—is the Image, Word, and Son of the Father:

> Similarly, the Son is the image, word and son. "Image" designates that person as an expressed likeness (*similitudinem expressam*); "word" as an expressive likeness (*similitudinem expressivam*); "son" as hypostatic likeness (*similitudinem hypostaticam*); again, "image" as a conforming likeness (*similitudinem conformem*), "word" as an intellectual likeness (*similitudinem intellectualem*), "son" as a connatural likeness (*similitudinem connaturalem*).[15]

This passage concisely summarizes Bonaventure's theology of the second person: he is *Imago*, *Verbum* and *Filius*.[16] As *Imago*, he is an expressed likeness of the Father; as *Verbum*, he is expressive as exemplar; and as *Filius*, he is hypostatically similar to—connatural with—the Father, his eternal origin.

But what about the Spirit? Is he not implicated in the identity of the Son? What does the Spirit have to do with this kind of a description of the second person of the Holy Trinity? As I will argue below in Section 2, the Spirit is far from peripheral to the identity of the Son. The identity of the Son

---

[12] "Supreme wisdom grants (*ponit*) the Trinity." *Brev.*, 1.2.5 (5:211b).

[13] *Brev.*, 1.2.5 (5:211b). See also *Hex*. 11.2-4 (5:380a-381a), where Bonaventure employs the same strategy.

[14] The Son as the middle person in the Holy Trinity finds expression in Richard of St.Victor's *De Trinitate*, which the *Summa Halensis* incorporates. Bonaventure's emphasis on the centrality of the Son develops the insight of these texts. See *De Trinitate* 5.14 (ed. Ribaillier, 212); *SH* I, n. 304, ad 2-3 (1:440b); and Coolman, "The Comprehensive Trinitarianism of the *Summa Halensis*," 134.

[15] *Brev.*, 1.3.8 (5:212a).

[16] Very likely in the background lies the *Summa Halensis*. Coolman, "The Comprehensive Trinitarianism of the *Summa Halensis*," 138: "[In the *Breviloquium*,] Bonaventure's choice of proper titles for the Persons, and accompanying explanations, is nearly identical to the Halensist's."

is incomplete, even truncated, without reference to the Holy Spirit. Indeed, each title of the Son—*Verbum*, *Imago*, *Filius*—includes a pneumatological component.

1.2 *Modes of Emanation in the* Summa Halensis

I do not want to move too precipitously though. Before reflecting on the Son in a pneumatological mode, I turn to the *Summa Halensis*' treatment of the two modes of emanation in God: *per modum naturae* and *per modum voluntatis*. As discussed in the previous chapter, the Father's fontal fullness realizes itself through these two modes of emanation. The former speaks to the generation of the Son and the latter to the spiration of the Spirit. In order to discuss Bonaventure's theology of the Son's generation (*per modum naturae*), I thus turn here to the *Summa Halensis*, which first developed this twofold schematic.[17]

The influence of the *Summa Halensis* on Bonaventure's thought is unmistakable.[18] A thorough analysis of this influence remains far beyond the scope of this present study. Nonetheless, I here individuate a few conceptual elements utilized by Bonaventure in his trinitarian theology that have a firm precedent in the *Summa Halensis*. In particular, I consider the theology of goodness as self-diffusive and the way in which the intrinsic communicative dynamic of goodness realizes itself through the emanations of the second and third divine persons.

The diffusive character of goodness plays a key role in the *Summa Halensis*' trinitarian theology. Coolman argues that the concept of goodness is used by the *Summa Halensis* to explain "*why* (not just *that*) there is ...

---

[17] On the *Summa Halensis*, see n10 in the previous chapter.

[18] A thorough study of this influence has yet to be completed. For an excellent concise treatment of the trinitarian theology of the *Summa Halensis*, see Coolman's "The Comprehensive Trinitarianism of the *Summa Halensis*." In his conclusion, Coolman writes: "An immediate indicator of the historical importance of the *SH*'s Trinitarian theology in the EFIT [Early Franciscan Intellectual Tradition] is its influence on Bonaventure" (137).

plurality in God."[19] As the *Summa Halensis* puts it, "supreme goodness is as the principal cause of this multiplication in God."[20]

To explain how the good is the *ratio numeri* in God, the *Summa Halensis* refers to its communication through the mode of nature and the mode of the will: "Therefore, goodness communicates itself (*communicat se*) either through the mode of nature (*per modum naturae*) or through the mode of the will (*per modum voluntatis*)."[21] Goodness is more perfect, moreover, if it diffuses itself through both modes.[22] There is, thus, the communication of the good *per modum naturae* and *per modum voluntatis* in God. Furthermore, as is the case with Bonaventure, this goodness is rooted in the person of the Father.[23] Both Bonaventure and the *Summa Halensis* thus develop a thoroughly personal trinitarian theology.

The communication of the good *per modum naturae* refers to the generation of the Son, while communication of the good *per modum voluntatis* refers to the procession of the Spirit. "Apart from such perfect and

---

[19] Coolman, "The Comprehensive Trinitarianism of the *Summa Halensis*," 120. Coolman offers a helpful "genealogy" of goodness: "From Augustine and the Damascene, comes first of all a basic (neoplatonic) notion of God as good; from the Dionysian corpus comes the principle of the good as by nature *diffusivum sui*, as self-diffusive. From Richard of St. Victor, comes the lexical precision of *plenitudo*, of God as the *fullness* of good; from William of Auxerre, comes the notion of good as *perfecta communicatio*, of perfect self-communicating goodness. All these streams merge into the *SH* with the notion of the *bonum* as flowing, self-diffusive, self-communicative, ecstatic plenitude, and of the *summum bonum* as maximally and perfectly such" (120-121).

[20] "It should be said—when it is asked from where comes number or the *ratio* of number in God (*in divinis*)—that this number is in part (*ex parte*) from the perfection of virtue, goodness, and charity. Yet … the *ratio* of goodness is like the principal *ratio* of that number: because the praise of good and its perfection is shown in communication (*in communicatione*), but communication is always of one to another (*unius ad alium*). Therefore, where there is communion, there is always one and another, and thus multiplication and number, and the supreme goodness is as the principal cause of this multiplication in God." *SH* I, n. 317, sol. (1:465b). See also *SH* I, n. 64, ad 4 and 5 (1:96b-97a); *SH* I, n. 295, §*b* (1:414b-415a).

[21] *SH* I, n. 317, sol. (1:465b).

[22] "There are two principles of diffusion (*diffusionis*) in things (*in rebus*): nature and will (*natura et voluntas*). The most perfect, however, diffusion of nature is that which occurs through generation, and the most perfect diffusion of will is that which occurs through *amorem* or *dilectionem*. This is the praise of goodness (*laus bonitatis*) in things. More praiseworthy though is the good that diffuses itself (*diffundit se*) in both ways than that which diffuses itself in only one way. Therefore, if what is praiseworthy and perfect cannot be lacking in the highest good (*summo bono*), it follows that, in the highest good—which is God—there is a diffusion through generation ... and there will be a diffusion *per modum dilectionis*, which we call the procession of the Holy Spirit." *SH* I, n. 304, §*a* (1:438a). See also *SH* I, n. 319, §*c* (1:468b) and n. 295 (1:414-415).

[23] See *SH*, I, n. 297, ad 10 and ad 23 (1:427a and 428b); Coolman, "The Comprehensive Trinitarianism of the *Summa Halensis*," 126-127.

complete self-diffusion of the good *ad intra*," as Coolman summarizes, "God would not be the *summum bonum*."[24] It is worth noting, furthermore, that these modalities are in themselves good.[25]

As the *Summa Halensis* develops its trinitarian theology, both Pseudo-Dionysius' metaphysics of the good and Richard of St. Victor's theology of charity as articulated in his *De Trinitate* comprise key components. The *Summa Halensis* effectively develops a kind of synthesis between a dionysian conception of the good and a richardian analysis of love.[26] To echo the *Summa* itself: "In supreme goodness (*summa bonitate*) there cannot be lacking (*non potest deesse*) the highest and foremost charity."[27] In this way, then, communication *per modum naturae* refers to the generation of the *dilectus*; similarly, communication *per modum voluntatis* corresponds to the spiration of the *condilectus*. "The perfection of the good consists in communion."[28]

Before returning to Bonaventure, one further point deserves mention. In the *Summa Halensis*, the communication of the good is realized infinitely. When the text asks if there is a *ratio numeri* in God, a contrary argument concludes in the negative. It states that power (*virtus*), if infinite, would find its realization in an infinite act that would thereby lead to an infinite multiplication of persons.[29] To respond, the *Summa Halensis* grants that *virtus* is infinite and is in fact conjoined to an infinite act of production. In order to evade the incorrect conclusion, though, it then makes an important

---

[24] Coolman, "The Comprehensive Trinitarianism of the *Summa Halensis*," 123.

[25] The *Summa Halensis* refers explicitly to the *bonitas naturae* and the *bonitas voluntatis* (*SH* I, n. 317, sol. [1:465b]). When Bonaventure develops his theory of the *voluntas acceptans*—see Section 3.2.2 below—it is important to keep in mind the intrinsic goodness of these two modalities. The divine will is utterly accepting of the intrinsic communication of divine life because that intrinsic communication is fundamentally good.

[26] While Richard of St. Victor also coupled charity with goodness, he lacks the explicit diffusive character of the good derived from Pseudo-Dionysius. Coolman ("The Comprehensive Trinitarianism of the *Summa Halensis*," 114) intimates: "If Richard does not himself produce a synthesis of Victorine and Dionysian thought, as clearly occurs in Bonaventure, where the Victorine terminology is animated and conditioned by the Dionysian dynamics of fecundity, does that synthesis have an intervening precedent? The most obvious and plausible answer ... is Bonaventure's teacher, Alexander of Hales. Both his undisputed works and the *SH* make extensive use of both Dionysius and Richard. Many of the Dionysian notions that will figure centrally in Bonaventure, moreover, including fontality, fecundity, the good as self-diffusive (*bonum diffusivum sui*) and divine love as an eternal circle, are found in these texts. At the same time, the *SH* cites Richard's Trinitarian theology extensively."

[27] *SH*, I, n. 304, §*e* (1:439a). See also *SH* I, n. 311, resp. (1:453ab).

[28] *SH*, I, n. 76, contra *b* (1:121b).

[29] *SH*, I, n. 317, n. 3 (1:465ab).

distinction: "But an infinite production is said in two ways: either because an infinite number of things are produced or because those things, which are produced, or that which is produced, is infinite in goodness."[30]

The first way does not befit God because it is imperfect. The second way, however, does befit divine life, "because that which is produced therein, whether the Son or the Holy Spirit, is infinite in goodness (*infinitus bonitate*)."[31] Bonaventure takes a very similar approach in, for example, his *Itinerarium* when he argues that the highest good is only realized if there is actual and intrinsic generation and spiration; only that can speak to the "immensity of eternal goodness."[32]

1.3 *Basic Contours of Bonaventure's Theology of Generation*

In his *Commentarius in Primum Librum Sententiarum*, Bonaventure offers a variety of arguments to show that the divine persons are no more and no less than three. One of the arguments is based on his understanding of perfection, which entails communication: "therefore the producing person produces perfectly both with respect to the mode of producing and with respect to that which is produced."[33] As stated previously, however, for Bonaventure—drawing from Aristotle and the synthesis of the *Summa Halensis*—there are only two modes of emanating that can fit this description, namely *per modum naturae* and *per modum voluntatis*. God who is perfect, pure being and pure act, is thus perfectly communicative. In the *Breviloquium*, Bonaventure offers a fine synthesis:

> Since the first and highest principle—precisely because it is first—is most simple (*hoc ipso quod primum, sit simplicissimum*) and—precisely because it is highest—is most perfect (*hoc ipso quod summum, sit perfectissimum*), it therefore perfectly communicates itself (*perfectissime se communicat*) because it is most perfect. And by dint of being most simple (*hoc ipso quod simplicissimum*), it conserves indivision completely. Therefore, with the unity of nature conserved (*salva unitate naturae*), there are [in that first and highest principle]

---

[30] *SH* I, n. 317, ad 3 (1:466b).
[31] *SH* I, n. 317, ad 3 (1:466b).
[32] *Itin.*, 6.2 (5:310b); see n51 in Chapter One above.
[33] *I Sent.*, d. 2, au., q. 4, fund. 2 (1:56b). See also the response to the same question (1:57a-58a); *Myst. Trin.*, q. 4, a. 2, resp. (5:85b), q. 8, resp. (5:114a); and *Itin.*, 6.2 (5:311a).

modes of emanating perfectly. The modes, however, of emanating perfectly are only two, namely *per modum naturae et voluntatis*. The first is generation, and the second is spiration or procession, and thus these are found therein.[34]

Broadly speaking, Bonaventure will define *generare* as "to produce a likeness to oneself in substance and in nature."[35] Understood as such, generation can take place in a variety of ways. Bonaventure individuates three types. The first type of generation consists of the impression of a given likeness in another, e.g., when the seal of a stamp generates a likeness of itself when impressed on wax. The second type consists of the generation of species from something else, e.g., when an element is generated by another element.[36] The third type of generation, which is more perfect than the other two, takes place only in living beings. This type of generation is found, albeit *differenter*, in both God and in creatures. While in creatures generation obtains *ex parte sui*, as when a parent generates offspring,[37] only in God does generation take place *ex se toto*—thanks to divine simplicity.[38] Bonaventure specifies, furthermore, that in God there is real distinction between the one generating and the one generated.[39]

Lastly, a point of clarification: while there is distinction and order in the Holy Trinity, there is no *before* and *after*. Bonaventure's theology of divine

---

[34] *Brev.*, 1.3.2 (5:211a).

[35] *I Sent.*, d. 9, au., q. 1, resp. (1:181a). See Hayes, "Introduction," 44.

[36] Hayes ("Introduction," 44 [n64]) gives the example of fire being produced from wood.

[37] *I Sent.*, d. 9, au., q. 1, resp. (1:181b).

[38] "Only he is able to produce *ex se toto*, whose essence is able to be in a plurality one and whole. For if it is not able to be in a plurality one and whole, then if the one generating (*generans*) gives his whole substance to the one generated (*generato*), then that whole substance would transition over into (*transit in*) the one generated, and the one generating would lose his whole substance by generating, but this cannot be the case. Therefore, it is thus necesary that [the one generating] have such a substance, which [can be] one and whole in a plurality. Such a substance, however, is not unless it is that substance having the highest simplicity; this, however, is only the divine essence, in which, on behalf of its highest simplicity, a supposit does not add [anything] to the essence, whence it neither restricts it nor limits it nor multiplies the form. And therefore in that [essence] there is able to be generation that communicates (*generatio communicans*) the whole of its substance; and such generation is in every way perfect and is found in God alone, for the reason just described." *I Sent.*, d. 9, au., q. 1, resp. (1:181ab). See also *Myst. Trin.*, q. 6, a. 2, ad 7 (5:105b).

[39] "It should be said that generation in God (*in divinis*), as was shown, renders the distinction between the one generating and the one generated real (*facit realem distinctionem*), not only a rational or intellectual [distinction], as Sabellius said; and [it renders] the distinction real regarding the person (*realem quantum ad personam*), not regarding the essence, as Arius said." *I Sent.*, d. 9, au., q. 2, resp. (1:183a).

order does not imply or connote a sequential understanding of the divine emanations. Accordingly, when Bonaventure asks if the generation of the Son is eternal, the answer is a firm *yes*. He bases this answer on the "highest and perfect fecundity" of the one generating and on the "highest and perfect equality" of the one generated.[40] Moreover, Bonaventure affirms that generation is eternal also because of the highest actuality in both the Father and Son, "in which the act is not distant from potency, nor does the power (*posse*) precede being (*esse*)."[41] Trinitarian order does not in any way designate temporal sequence or spatial arrangement, but rather the supreme intelligibility, infinite intimacy, and perfect beauty of God who is "Holy, Holy, Holy" (Is 6:3; Rev 4:8).

2. Who is Generated? Towards a Pneumatological Theology of the Middle Person

I turn now specifically to the second divine person: the Son eternally generated by the eternal Father. This section forms a crucial part of the present chapter. Here, I develop the connection of the second divine person—as Word, Image, and Son—to the Spirit.[42] Explicating this relationship prepares for the third section of this chapter, which inquires into the precise concomitant relationship between generation and spiration.

2.1 *The Word and the Spirit*

I begin with the following question: "Whether the eternal Word connotes anything in terms of created being (*ex parte creaturae*)?"[43] Drawing from Anselm's *Monologion*, Bonaventure begins his response by affirming that a word is generated "when a likeness or an image of something knowable is conceived by the mind."[44] Bonaventure then specifies how this conception

---

[40] *I Sent.*, d. 9, au., q. 4 (1:185a).
[41] *I Sent.*, d. 9, au., q. 4 (1:185a).
[42] Other authors have commented on Bonaventure's theology of these three titles. See, for example, Hayes, "Introduction," 48-53. As far as I am aware, however, no one has made explicit how *each* of these titles includes a pneumatological nuance.
[43] *I Sent.*, d. 27, p. 2, au., q. 2 (1:484).
[44] *I Sent.*, d. 27, p. 2, au., q. 2, resp. (1:485ab).

unfolds in the Father. The Father knows himself and all things under one aspect, namely the begotten Word:

> And because in him [the Father] the conceptive power (*vis conceptiva*) conceives a likeness—which encompasses all things under one glance or aspect (*omnia circumplectentem sub intuitu uno sive aspectu*)—he conceives or generates one Word, which is an imitative likeness (*similitudo imitativa*) of the Father and an exemplary likeness (*similitudo exemplativa*) of things and an operative likeness (*similitudo operativa*); and thus, [the Word] holds as it were the center point (*tenet quasi medium*).[45]

The Word thus contains a reference both to the Father and to created being, of which it is the exemplar.[46] Consequently, so Bonaventure argues in the following question, the Word is both an expressed likeness (*similitudo expressa*) and an expressive likeness (*similitudo expressiva*).[47] The Word is "most similar to and expressive of the Father."[48]

This expressive character of the Word finds perhaps its climatic synthesis in Bonaventure's later *Collationes in Hexaemeron*.[49] In this text, the Seraphic Doctor unravels the inner logic of the Word's expressive identity. Specifically, Bonaventure makes explicit that the expressive character of the Word entails—in addition to an exemplary relation to creation—the Word's involvement in the very spiration of the Spirit.

The expressive identity of the second person in general emerges already in the first collation of the *Hexaemeron*, where Bonaventure argues that Christ holds the center in all things.[50] In that analysis, Bonaventure identifies Christ first and foremost as the center of the very inner life of God.

---

[45] *I Sent.*, d. 27, p. 2, au., q. 2, resp. (1:485b).

[46] Cf. Giuseppe Beschin, "Exemplar," in *Dizionario Bonaventuriano*, 367-380.

[47] *I Sent.*, d. 27, p. 2, au., q. 3, resp. (1:488a). Bonaventure arrives at this conclusion from a passage of St. Anselm that draws a parallel between human knowing and the Word in God. In brief, in order to think of, for example, some person who is absent, the human subject forms an image of that person in her mind. This image is a "word" of that person. When God understands himself, a "word" is thus born that is "shaped (*formatam*) according to his likeness (*ad sui similitudinem*) as if by its own impression (*quasi sua impressione*). This image is its word." The Word is an expressed likeness of the Father, and expressive of all other things.

[48] *In Luc.*, 3.56 (7:84b).

[49] Cf. Woźniak, "La teología de la mediación," 332.

[50] *Hex.*, 1.10 (5:330b-331a).

Therefore, the first center (*medium*), that of essence, is primary because of eternal generation. For "being" (*esse*) is said in two ways: either "being," which is from itself and according to itself and for the sake of itself (*ex se et secundum se et propter se*), or "being," which is from another and according to another and for the sake of another (*ex alio et secundum aliud et propter aliud*). For it is necessary that "being," which is from itself, be according to itself and for the sake of itself. "Being" from itself is in the reason of the one originating (*ratione originantis*); "being" according to itself is in the reason of the one exemplifying (*ratione exemplantis*), and "being for the sake of itself" is in the reason of the one finishing or terminating (*ratione finientis vel terminantis*); that is, in the reason of the principle (*ratio principii*), the center (*medii*) and the end or term (*et finis seu termini*). The Father in the reason of the originating principle (*originantis principii*); the Son in the reason of the exemplary center (*exemplantis medii*); the Holy Spirit in the reason of the terminating completion (*terminantis complementi*).[51]

In this extremely rich passage, Bonaventure outlines the basic structure of triune life. He identifies centrality in terms of exemplarity. The Holy Trinity is *secundum se* by virtue of the Son's exemplarity. What does this mean?

It has to do with generation, and, in particular, with the expressive character of the Word. The Father, in his eternal generation of the Word, expresses all things.[52] Accordingly—as alluded to above—the second person, as center, is expressive even of the Trinity: for this reason, the Trinity is *secundum se* per the Word's exemplarity. In other words, the Trinity is according to the Word because the Word contains the whole framework of trinitarian life: the Father produces, and the Spirit is produced, but the *persona media* is both produced by the Father, and productive with the Father of the Spirit.[53]

While Bonaventure, at this point, is emphatic that the Word expresses the Father, it is only in a later collation wherein he will take the logic of expression to its conclusion. The Word, that is, is not only expressive of the truth of things as their eternal exemplar. Expressive of the Father, the Word

---

[51] *Hex.*, 1.12 (5:331ab).

[52] "For the Father from eternity begot the Son like himself and he spoke himself and his likeness similar to himself and with this his whole power; he spoke what he could do (*posset facere*), and especially (*maxime*) what he wanted to do (*voluit facere*), and [the Father] expressed all things in him (*omnia in eo expressit*), namely in the Son or in that center (*medio*) as if in his art. Whence that center (*medium*) is truth." *Hex.*, 1.13 (5:331b). See also *Hex.*, 1.16 (5:332a).

[53] *Hex.*, 1.14 (5:331b-332a). See also *Hex.*, 8.12 (5:371a); Hellmann, *Divine and Created Order*, 62.

must also express, so to speak, the Father's spiration of the Spirit. Bonaventure insinuates this implication in his discussion of the Uncreated Word in the third collation, where he—drawing from Anselm and Augustine—explains how highest Spirit begets a likeness of itself.

> This likeness, however, is the Word, because, according to Augustine and Anselm, the likeness of the mind turning upon itself (*mentis convertentis se super se*), which is in the sight of the mind (*in acie mentis*), is a word. If therefore this likeness is equal, therefore it is God, and having originated from God [the Father] it represents the one giving origin (*originantem*) and whatever the Father can do (*quidquid Pater potest*) .... Again, since [the Word] represents the power (*virtutem*) of the Father, he represents power that is most unified; but "power, the more united it is, the more infinite it is (*virtus, quanto magis unita, tanto magis infinita*)." Therefore, that likeness [= the Word] must represent infinite power.[54]

As made clear in the previous chapter, Bonaventure will refer to this maxim from the *Liber de Causis* in order to articulate the intrinsic communication of divine life. When he says, therefore, that the Word represents the most unified, and thus infinite, power of the Father, Bonaventure is ultimately referring to the intrinsic communication of divine life. Indeed, Bonaventure makes the connection explicit: "And the Word expresses the Father as the originating principle (*principium principians*) of himself, and thus is explicative and representative (*explicans et repraesentans*) of the production of the Holy Spirit."[55]

---

[54] *Hex.*, 3.4 (343b-344a). See also *Myst. Trin.*, q. 4, a. 2, ad 8 and 9 (5:87ab). Antonellus Elsässer explains well the kind of self-reflexive intellection to which the quoted passage from the *Hexaemeron* refers: "Jeder Geist nämlich zeugt durch Erkennen, d. h. er bringt im Augenblick des Erkennens ein Gleichbild des erkannten Gegenstandes hervor. Wenn er sich also selbst erkennt, so bringt er ein vollkommen sich selbst ähnliches Gleichbild hervor. Der Vater aber ist der höchste Geist und als solcher muß er sich notwendigerweise selbst erkennen. Da aber das Erkannte in Gott mit dem Erkennenden übereinstimmt, erkennt der Vater, was er ist und was er kann. Also ist auch der Grund des Erkennens mit dem erkennenden Verstand identisch, dessen Gleichbild er ist. Dieses Gleichbild aber ist das *Wort*, weil nach Augustinus und Anselm das Ebenbild des sich zu sich selbst wendenden Geistes, das in der höchsten Spitze des Geistes entsteht, das Wort ist. Und da das Gleichbild vollkommen übereinstimmt, ist es selbst Gott und, von Gott hervorgebracht, stellt es den Hervorbringenden dar und alles was der Vater vermag. Denn in ihm hat der Vater sich selbst und alles ausgesprochen und zum Ausdruck gebracht." *Christus der Lehrer des Sittlichen. Die christologischen Grundlagen für die Erkenntnis des Sittlichen nach der Lehre Bonaventuras* (München – Paderborn – Wien: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, 1968), 70.

[55] *Hex.*, 3.7 (5:44ab). See also *Hex.*, 9.2 (5:372b-373a).

The Word is totally expressive of the Father, and thus is expressive of what is most proper to the Father: fontality. At this point, the Spirit's identity as *ratio finiendi* implicitly emerges. The spiration of the Spirit manifests not only the *status* of the Father's infinite fecundity, but also of the Word's expressive likeness of that fecundity. As expressive, the Word culminates in the spiration of the Spirit with the Father. Constitutive of the Word's expressiveness is the coeternal spiration of the Spirit.[56]

Consequently, the full actuality of divine life lies not just in the Father's expressed likeness, but also in the spiration of Love. Actuality is trinitarian. Bonaventure accentuates the trinitarian shape of actuality in his *De mysterio Trinitatis*. He speaks of supreme actuality in terms of a kind of self-reflexiveness: *conversionem eiusdem supra se*.[57] This language explains both the generation of the Word, as well as the spiration of Love. *Conversionem eiusdem supra se* takes place "by knowing and by loving (*intelligendo et amando*), and knowing includes a word, and love (*amor*) includes a nexus (*nexum*)." And since it is consonant with the First Principle to know and to love, so it is consonant that there be a generation of a Word and spiration of Love. Bonaventure thereby interlocks generation and spiration—a theme to which I will return in Section 3 of this chapter. At this point, I want only to underscore that complete actuality realizes itself in a completely personal way: through the Father's emanation of the Word and their mutual spiration of Love. Highest actuality thus means that the Word is not devoid of Love. Pure act requires both. They implicate one another.

2.2 *The Image and the Spirit*

Bonaventure spells out his theology of the term *imago* as a title of the Son in *I Sent*., d. 31, p. 2, a. 1, wherein he treats the appropriations of St.

---

[56] See also *I Sent*., d. 2, au., q. 4, ad 2 (1:58b), where Bonaventure responds to an argument, which concluded that any other emanation in addition to the generation of the Word would be superfluous because the Father expresses himself fully already in the Word. To respond, Bonaventure says that the Son does not declare the Father in every way because, even if the Son is *secundum rationem naturae*, he is not "according to the generosity (*liberalitatem*) of the will, except insofar as from the Word itself the Spirit proceeds."

[57] *Myst. Trin*., q. 6, a. 2, resp. (5:104b). Bonaventure uses similar language at *Hex*., 3.4 (see n54 above).

Hilary: *aeternitas* (→ Father), *species* (→ Son), and *usus* (→ Holy Spirit).[58] The first question clarifies what kind of term is *imago*: "Whether image in God is said according to substance or according to relation."[59]

To respond, Bonaventure makes a distinction between *exemplar* and *imago*. The former bespeaks expression *per modum activi*. To this degree, the second divine person is *exemplar* because he expresses in his person all things, which are made in view of him. *Imago*, however, is said *per modum passivi*: "and that which expresses and imitates (*exprimit et imitatur*) another is called an image."[60] As stated in one of the *fundamenta*, "where there is the concept of an image (*ratio imaginis*), there is imitation (*imitatio*)."[61]

Yet Bonaventure makes a further distinction. An image's imitation is either "in the unity of nature, or in the diversity of nature."[62] The second divine person is Image in the unity of nature. He is not essentially other than God. The human person, however, is an *imago Dei*, but does not share in the divine nature. Bonaventure explains:

> Thus with respect to God *imago* is said through the expression according to the identity of nature; and thus it is an uncreated image and is said notionally or according to relation, because image bespeaks emanation, but an emanation in the unity of nature is not unless [an emanation] of a [divine] person.[63]

The second divine person images the Father in the unity of nature. Ultimately, then, for Bonaventure—as well as the *Summa Halensis* but unlike Aquinas[64]—the Son is Image because he spirates, together with the Father, the Spirit. To arrive at this conclusion, Bonaventure first develops his theory of what the constitution of image entails.

---

[58] *Species*, a term hard to render into English, connotes form, beauty, representation, appearance, image. In part, *species* is appropriated to the second person because, as Image, he perfectly reflects the Father's beauty and in virtue of his emanation *per modum naturae*, the second divine person "has in himself the nature (*rationem*) of an expressed likeness (*expressae similitudinis*), and therefore of knowing (*cognitionis*), because an expressed likeness is the principle of knowing (*ratio cognoscendi*)" (*I Sent.*, d. 31, p. 2, a. 1, q. 3, resp. [1:544a]). Bonaventure also treats Hilary's appropriations at *Brev.*, 1.6.3 (5:215a).

[59] *I Sent.*, d. 31, p. 2, a. 1, q. 1 (1:539).

[60] *I Sent.*, d. 31, p. 2, a. 1, q. 1, resp. (1:540a).

[61] *I Sent.*, d. 31, p. 2, a. 1, q. 1, fund. 4 (1:540a).

[62] *I Sent.*, d. 31, p. 2, a. 1, q. 1, resp. (1:540a).

[63] *I Sent.*, d. 31, p. 2, a. 1, q. 1, resp. (1:540a).

[64] See *SH* I, n. 418, resp. (1:609a); Coolman, "The Comprehensive Trinitarianism of the *Summa Halensis*," 135.

Fundamental to his understanding of the Son as image is the way *imago* functions, so to speak, in God: "image, in God, bespeaks not only the expression of a person, but also expression in the highest degree (*in summo*)."[65] To image *in summo* requires two features. First, it must be one-to-one: the image cannot express *in summo* a plurality, nor can something be expressed *in summo* by a plurality. Second, it must be an expression in every way: the image must be expressive in every respect.[66]

How do these features apply to the second divine person? Regarding the first feature: he proceeds from one person alone. Accordingly, the Holy Spirit cannot be called "image" since he proceeds from two; so he cannot be the expression of one *in summo*. Regarding the second feature: the Son is also said to be an image because he is expressive in every respect. Bonaventure argues:

> On behalf of the second reason, only the Son is image, because he has the reason of expressing (*rationem exprimendi*) according to every respect, both in relation to the one from whom he is (*comparatur ad illum a quo est*), and in relation to the one who is from him (*comparatur ad illum qui ex ipso est*). Insofar as he is in relation to the one from whom he is: because he comes forth *per modum naturae*, and thus through the mode of the word and of the species and through the mode of an expressed likeness. Insofar as he is in relation to the one who is from him: because as a whole and through the same way the Son spirates, just as the Father.[67]

As this passage makes clear, the Son is rightly called Image because he is the Word: he emanates *per modum naturae* and so expresses an utter likeness of the Father. This expressed likeness, however, includes a certain kind of imitation or mirroring of the Father: the Son spirates, "just as the Father." Image includes imitation. The Son is totally in sync with the Father. Hence, for Bonaventure the Son is image precisely because he imitates the Father "in the production of a person."[68] He is expressive of the Father in every respect.

---

[65] *I Sent.*, d. 31, p. 2, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (1:542a); see also fund. 3 (1:541a), where Bonaventure defines image as an "expressed likeness and, in God (*in divinis*), a most expressed likeness (*similitudo expressissima*)."

[66] *I Sent.*, d. 31, p. 2, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (1:542a).

[67] *I Sent.*, d. 31, p. 2, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (1:542ab). See Hayes, *The Hidden Center*, 58.

[68] "Again, image in God (*in divinis*) is considered (*attenditur*) according to the imitation (*imitationem*) of a person, not of the essence, because it is not an image of the essence, but of a person. Therefore, for this to obtain—that one person is an image of

For the Seraphic Doctor, the title *imago* thus includes and entails a robust pneumatological orientation of the second person. The Son is *imago* because he is an imitative likeness of the Father—with whom he spirates the Spirit. Both Father and Son breathe Love.

2.3 *The Son and the Spirit*

I turn now to Bonaventure's theology of the Son. The name "Son" highlights the relationship of the second divine person to the Father. At first glance, then, it would not seem to have a clear pneumatological connotation. A certain descriptor, however, illuminates this connotation: *dilectus*. The Son begotten by the Father is beloved by the Father. Herein lies the pneumatological aspect of Bonaventure's theology of the Son.

The pneumatological nuance of Christ—the beloved Son of the Father—comes to light in Bonaventure's commentary on the Gospel of Luke's account of Christ's baptism. In this scene, the "glorification (*clarificatio*)" of the whole Trinity takes place. The narrative of Christ's baptism reveals the Trinity.[69]

Especially relevant here is Bonaventure's interpretation of the way in which this scene reveals the Father: "To indicate (*ad signandam*) the person of the Father, it is added: 'A voice came from heaven.' ... It is made clear that this voice was in the person of the Father when it is added: 'You are my Son,' namely only begotten, generated from eternity."[70] The Father, however, not only declares that Jesus is his Son, but that he is *dilectus*: "And because he [the Father] loves him [the Son] supremely (*summe diligit*), it is thus added: 'beloved' (*dilectus*)."[71]

This concise statement—especially the term: *dilectus*—contains an implicit, even cryptic, reference to the Holy Spirit. To unlock the reference,

---

another—it is necessary for that person [i.e., the one who is Image] to imitate the other in that which pertains (*respicit*) to the person as person; but the emanation or the production of a person pertains to the person as person; for the production of a creature regards the substance. Since therefore only the Son imitates the Father in the production of a person, only the Son is image." *I Sent.*, d. 31, p. 2, a. 1, q. 2, fund. 4 (1:541ab).

[69] *In Luc.*, 3.47 (7:81b).
[70] *In Luc.*, 3.55 (7:84a).
[71] *In Luc.*, 3.55 (7:84a).

Bonaventure's theology of the Spirit as the love of the Father and the Son is key. The Father and the Son love one another by the Holy Spirit.[72] Accordingly, when Bonaventure asserts that the Father loves the Son supremely, therein lies the Holy Spirit as Love.

As Bonaventure continues his reflection, he renders more explicit the implicit pneumatology of the Son as *dilectus*: "And for a greater expression, it is added: 'in you it has pleased me (*in te complacuit mihi*),' that is, all things which are pleasing (*omne scilicet, quod placet*); and this on behalf of (*propter*) the most perfect *nexum* of love [= the Holy Spirit], which is between (*inter*) the Father and the Son."[73] Accordingly, while the title "Son" intends to illuminate the second divine person's relation to the Father, its depth of meaning goes even further.[74] As *beloved*, the title *Son* contains information, as it were, about the third divine person. The beloved Son is pleasing to the Father on behalf of the nexus that is the Holy Spirit between them: trinitarian life culminates in "the most perfect *nexum* of love," which binds together Father and Son.

Ultimately, then, the very generation of the Son is concomitant with or accompanied by the spiration of the Spirit. For this reason, Bonaventure, when discussing generation, explicitly states that the Son—generated *per modum naturae*—is nonetheless generated *ut dilectus*.[75] For Bonaventure, the Son as beloved entails the Holy Spirit.

To conclude, I refer to a precious passage from the *De mysterio Trinitatis*:

> Again, more perfect (*perfectior*) is unity, in which with a unity of nature there remains a unity of charity (*unitas caritatis*); but "charity stretches forth toward another (*ad alium tendit*)": therefore, it includes the distinction of the one loving and the beloved (*diligentis et dilecti*).[76]

---

[72] I will discuss the significance of this statement and the theology behind it in Section 2.3 of the following chapter.

[73] *In Luc.*, 3.55 (7:84b).

[74] In this regard, Hayes' ("Christology and Metaphysics," 89) remark that "to speak of him [the second person] as Son expresses only his relation to the Father" is not entirely accurate.

[75] *I Sent.*, d. 6, au., q. 2, resp. (1:128a). I return to this distinction and topic below in the third section of this chapter.

[76] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 2, a. 2, fund. 9 (5:65a).

The *unitas caritatis* constitutes an implicit reference to the Holy Spirit.[77] As this passage suggests, then, Bonaventure understands the perfection (*perfectior*) of trinitarian love—clearly inspired by Richard of St. Victor's synthesis—as tied to the Holy Spirit, *unitas caritatis* of the loving Father and beloved Son.

2.4 *The Son as Center and the Spirit*

The Son as *dilectus* is not unrelated to the centrality of the second person in the divine life. This centrality also witnesses to the pneumatological nuance of the Son's identity. How so?

The Son as *persona media* entails order. Bonaventure's theology thereby links the centrality of the Son in an inseparable way to the principality of the Father and the finality of the Spirit. To be *medium* implies a certain connection to the extremes.[78] As Dettloff remarks: "The term *medium* expresses that something connects opposite elements, insofar as it is common to these opposite elements."[79] Hence an infinite number of divine persons would nullify the function of the *medium*. *Ordo* would collapse. "Where there is order," explains Bonaventure, "there is termination (*terminatio*), because where a termination is lacking (*deficit*), there is lacking also mediation (*mediatio*) and, as a consequence, order; but where there is a termination, there is not an infinity [of persons]."[80] The *medium*—the second person—is not a *medium* without the *terminatio*—the third person. Divine order reaches its zenith in the Spirit.

But how does the Son communicate with extremes? Why is he *medium*? As already stressed, Bonaventure's theology of *ordo* does not imply a

---

[77] See my "*Unitas caritatis*: Explicating an Implicit Reference to the Spirit in Bonaventure's *Quaestiones disputatae de mysterio Trinitatis*," in *Ut bon(aventuriani)i fiamius: Studies in St. Bonaventure on the Occasion of the 800th Anniversary of His Birth*, eds. Mirian Špelič et al. (Rome – Ljubljana: Quarrachi – University of Ljubljana Press, 2022), 133-149.

[78] "For a center (*medium*) bespeaks communication (*communicantiam*) with the extremes (*cum extremis*)." *III Sent.*, d. 19, a. 2, q. 2, resp. (3:410b). See also *II Sent.*, d. 14, p. 2, a. 1, q. 3, fund. 3 (2:355a).

[79] Dettloff, "Christus tenens medium in omnibus," 128. Cf. Bernardino de Armellada, "Medium," in *Dizionario Bonaventuriano*, 549-552.

[80] *I Sent.*, d. 2, au., q. 3, fund. 2 (1:55a).

sequential order in God: the Son's centrality does not imply that he comes *after* the Father as if *before* the Spirit. The pure act of pure goodness does not unfold chronologically. Instead, the Son as *medium* shares in the reality of the first and third person. The Son is *medium* because he shares in the love characteristic of the Father—*amor gratuitus*—and the love characteristic of the Spirit—*amor debitus*. The Son is thus *amor permixtus*. Said differently, he is origin—like the Father of the Spirit—and originated—like the Spirit from the Father.[81] He touches both extremes. Accordingly, the center of divine life is not centripetal but centrifugal: it reaches outward to the pure origin and the purely originated as one who is in the middle of both as *medium*. The center cannot be *medium* without sharing in the reality of the Holy Spirit.

3. Generation and Spiriation: An Implicate Order

As already alluded to above, generation *per modum naturae* involves *voluntas*, and spiration *per modum voluntatis* involves *natura*. A certain concomitant relationship obtains between these two emanations. Indeed, in the previous section, I showed that for Bonaventure, the second divine person's very identity as Word, Image, and Son implies the Holy Spirit.

The goal of this section is to explicate the concomitant relationship between generation and spiration. To do so, I suggest that the term "implicate order" describes well this interlacement of the two emanations. In brief: the two emanations mutually implicate one another.

To articulate the implicate order of generation and spiration, I divide what follows into three subsections. The first subsection functions as a kind of prologue: I introduce the term "implicate order," which I take from David Bohm's interpretation of quantum theory. Then, in the second and most substantial subsection, I explicate Bonaventure's theology of the concomitant relationship—implicate order—between the emanations, as articulated principally in his *Commentarius in Primum Librum Sententiarum* and *De*

---

[81] See *I Sent.*, d. 2, au., q. 4, resp. (1:57a-58b); *Red. art.*, 23 (5:325a); *Hex.*, 1.14, 11.6-7, 11.12 (5:331b-332a, 381a, 382a).

mysterio Trinitatis. The third subsection functions as a kind of epilogue: I engage briefly with Bonaventure's theology of *circumincessio* as indicative of implicate order.

3.1 *Prologue: The Implicate Order*

The term *implicate order* comes from quantum physicist David Bohm (1917-1992). Bohm's vision of an implicate order emerges from his interpretation of quantum theory. With this term, Bohm aims to describe the fundamental order of a thoroughly relational worldview. Bohm thinks, that is, that quantum theory requires something other than a fundamentally "mechanistic" interpretation of reality, which would be the more standard picture proposed by physics.

According to Bohm, a mechanistic order regards "the world ... as constituted of entities which are *outside of each other*, in the sense that they exist independently in different regions of space (and time) and interact through forces that do not bring about any changes in their essential natures."[82] The mechanistic whole is "a set of separately existent indivisible and unchangeable 'elementary particles,' which are the fundamental 'building blocks' of the entire universe."[83] While there is interaction in a mechanistic system, the fundamental parts of the system remain independent unities.

In an implicate order, however, "everything is enfolded into everything."[84] Significant about this order is that "each part contains information about the *whole object*."[85] "Each part is in a fundamental sense internally related in its basic activities to the whole and to all the other parts."[86] Bohm will often refer to the hologram as illustrative of what he

---

[82] David Bohm, *Wholeness and the Implicate Order* (London – New York: Routledge Classics, 2002), 219.

[83] Bohm, *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*, 219.

[84] Bohm, *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*, 225. For a short essay on the topic, see David Bohm, "The Implicate Order: A New Approach to the Nature of Reality," in *Beyond Mechanism: The Universe in Recent Physics and Catholic Thought*, ed. David Schindler (Lanham: University Press, 1986), 13-37.

[85] Bohm, *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*, 225.

[86] Bohm, *Unfolding Meaning: A Weekend of Dialogue* (London: Routledge, 1985), 13.

means by implicate order: "the order of a whole illuminated structure is 'enfolded' and 'carried' in the movement of light."[87] One might say that, for Bohm, unbroken wholeness is the primitive reality and is ontologically more fundamental than the separately existent parts.[88]

I need not offer here a thorough explication or evaluation of Bohm's speculations. Rather, I want merely to adopt his basic insight of "implicate order." That is, without proposing a superficial or precipitous endorsement of Bohm's system as a whole, I want only to propose that Bohm's fundamental insight of "implicate order"—which emphasizes undivided wholeness, structure, and internal relationality: an order of "enfoldment and unfoldment"[89]—can provide a promising trinitarian hermeneutic.[90]

For example, the idea of implicate order, when applied to the Trinity, stresses that the Trinity is not the product of three persons as three fundamental building blocks of the divine essence. Moreover, it also posits that enfolded within the persons themselves is the overall structure of the whole. This point coheres especially well with Bonaventure's own synthesis: *primitas* as fontal source of Son and Spirit; the *medium* as indicative of the trinitarian structure of love that is *gratuitus* and *debitus*; and the Spirit as *terminatio*—loving *nexus* of the Father and Son. Bonaventure's theology of divine *ordo* is an implicate order. The "total order is contained, in some *implicit* sense"[91] in each hypostatic termination of the Divine Being. From

---

[87] Bohm, *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*, 190. For Bohm's explanation of how a hologram works, see *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*, 182-186. In brief, while a photograph captures the light that bounces off of an object, which then results in a two-dimensional image, a hologram—which etymologically means "to write the whole"— provides something more. Through the use of lasers, an interference pattern is made, which contains information that can be unfolded in order to produce not just a two-dimensional image, but the whole image.

[88] "The mechanistic idea of external relationship as *fundamental* is therefore denied, though of course, such relationships are still considered to be real, but of secondary significance. That is to say, the order of the world as a structure of things that are basically external to each other comes out as a secondary order through the activity of unfoldment which emerges from a deeper and more inward implicate order." Bohm, "The Implicate Order," 26 (emphasis in original).

[89] See Bohm, "The Implicate Order," 24-27.

[90] As far as I know, Bohm—a physicist—had no intention of doing trinitarian theology. He is trying to take seriously the implications of the quantum theory and provide a fitting interpretation of the data. For this reason, I intend neither a complete endorsement of Bohm's thought nor even a major transposition of his thought into theology.

[91] Bohm, *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*, 188 (emphasis in original). Of course, in this quote Bohm is describing—not the Trinity, but—the implicate order in general.

another perspective, the whole structure of divine life springs forth from the Father, whose fontality eternally "unfolds," as it were, in the Son and the Spirit, both of whom ultimately return *ad Patrem* as original *status*.[92] The intelligible circle of divine life is an implicate order. Additionally, the whole theology of divine perichoresis/*circumincessio*—"co-intimacy, by which one is in the other"[93]—expresses, in principle, the fundamental insight of implicate order as inseparability: each person is perichoretically enfolded in the mystery of the other.

Specifically in terms of generation and spiration, an implicate order is also at play. For Bonaventure, generation is not a building block of the divine being alongside spiration. Rather, implicit in the Father's generation of the Son *per modum naturae* is the spiration of the Spirit *per modum voluntatis*.

3.2 *The Concomitance of Generation and Spiration*

To articulate Bonaventure's theology of the concomitance between generation and spiration, I divide this subsection into three segments.

The first two—and most substantial—segments concern the first and second questions of *I Sent.*, d. 6, where Bonaventure discusses aspects of the Son's generation. In the course of my analysis, I will also draw heavily from *Myst. Trin.*, q. 7, a. 1-2. As a more mature work, it develops further and articulates often more concisely the preliminary synthesis of the *Commentarius in Librum Sententiarum*.[94]

The third segment addresses briefly the Son's priority with respect to the Spirit specifically in terms of the concomitant relationship between generation and spiration.

---

[92] *I Sent.*, d. 2, au., q. 2, ad 4 (1:54b).
[93] *Itin.*, 6.2 (5:311a).
[94] For an excellent overview of *Myst. Trin.*, q. 7, see Goff, *Caritas in Primo*, 268-282. Although not as thorough, also helpful is Fehlner's *The Role of Charity*, 97-100. Both authors have very much informed my own reading of the text.

3.2.1 *I Sent*., d. 6, au., q. 1 (*Myst. Trin.*, q. 7, a. 1): Generation's Necessity

The first question of distinction six inquires into the "necessity" of generation: "Utrum generatio Filii sit secundum rationem necessitatis."[95] To answer this question, Bonaventure distinguishes between various forms of "necessity": "There is a certain necessity arising from a dissonant principle (*ex principio disconveniente*), a certain necessity from a deficient principle (*ex principio deficiente*), and a certain necessity from a fitting and sufficient principle (*ex principio conveniente et sufficiente*)."[96] These three map on to the different ways of classifying necessity in question 7 of the *De mysterio Trinitatis*. The threefold distinction of necessity proposed therein articulates the heart of their differences. Necessity is either:

- entirely extrinsic (*omnino extrinseca*),
- partially intrinsic and partially extrinsic (*partim intrinseca et partim extrinseca*), or
- entirely intrinsic (*omnino intrinseca*).[97]

Bonaventure classifies necessity as such because he wants to elucidate precisely what it means to speak about the Divine Being as necessary. He wants to avoid ascribing to God any sort of external principle of determination that would thereby jeopardize divine freedom.

Necessity: omnino extrinseca. "Necessity that is entirely extrinsic is that which has its origin from a principle that is external."[98] No cooperation obtains between the determining principle and the subject. Bonaventure further divides this type of necessity into the necessity of coaction, which runs

---

[95] *I Sent*., d. 6, au., q. 1 (1:125a).

[96] *I Sent*., d. 6, au., q. 1, resp. (1:125b). See n97 below.

[97] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 7, a. 1, resp. (5:107b). This threefold distinction links with the threefold distinction of *I Sent*., d. 6, au., q. 1, resp. (1:125b)—see n96 above—as follows: necessity *omnino extrinseca* → necessity *ex principio disconveniente*; necessity *partim intrinseca et partim extrinseca* → necessity *ex principio deficiente*; necessity *omnino intrinseca* → necessity *ex principio conveniente et sufficiente*. In d. 6, au., q. 1, resp. (1:126a), however, Bonaventure further divides necessity *ex principio conveniente et sufficiente* as that which "arises from a sufficient principle in ordering (*in disponendo*), and this is the necessity of disposed matter (*materiae dispositae*), which can be called the necessity of exigency (*exigentiae*); or in completing (*in complendo*), and this is the necessity of immutability." To be precise, it is this latter description that properly corresponds to necessity *omnino intrinseca* in *Myst. Trin*.

[98] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 7, a. 1, resp. (5:107b).

contrary to the will, and the necessity of violence, which runs contrary to nature.[99] In either case, necessity that is entirely extrinsic does not in any way pertain to the Divine Being: God is not determined by or dependent upon any external principle.

Necessity: partim intrinseca et partim extrinseca. "Necessity that is partly extrinsic and partly intrinsic," to take Goff's helpful definition, "is determined from an outside principle in terms of origin and end, yet allows for self-movement with respect to its end."[100] Bonaventure further divides this type of necessity into the necessity of indigence—e.g., the need for food— and the necessity of inevitability—e.g., the inevitability of death. Neither of these pertain to God.

Necessity: omnino intrinseca. Bonaventure is left with the necessity that is entirely intrinsic. This version of necessity "inheres (*inest*) in the thing by reason of (*ex*) its own nature; and this is the necessity of immutability and independence (*immutabilitatis et independentiae*)."[101] Necessity as such is found only in God, who is utterly independent—dependent on nothing or no one else. "This necessity is posited necessarily in the Divine Being, because God is *in se ipso* and *a se ipso*."[102] Bonaventure concludes, therefore, that God possesses *summam et perfectissimam necessitatem*.[103] The key point is that this kind of necessity entails that God is not in any way determined by an extrinsic principle. Hayes writes:

> Only the necessity of immutability may be applied to God. It cannot be a necessity that is imposed on Him from outside Himself; nor can it be any sort of divine need for a created being as the necessary condition for His existence as God. It can only be the inner necessity of the divine being to be always and completely self-sufficient and totally in conformity with itself.[104]

---

[99] While I am following q. 7, a. 1 of the *Myst. Trin.*, these divisions continue to correspond to Bonaventure's position at *I Sent.*, d. 6, au., q. 1.

[100] Goff, *Caritas in Primo*, 269.

[101] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 7, a. 1, resp. (5:107b).

[102] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 7, a. 1, resp. (5:107b). The reference to *in se ipso* refers to God's simplicity and *a se ipso* refers to God's infinity (see Goff, *Caritas in Primo*, 269). As simple, God cannot change: God is God. As infinite, God does not begin or depend on any other cause. Furthermore, while Bonaventure states that this kind of necessity is found *simpliciter* in God, he asserts that it is found to some degree (*secundum quid*) in creatures: see *Myst. Trin.*, q. 7, a. 1, resp. (5:107b).

[103] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 7, a. 1, resp. (5:108a).

[104] Hayes, "Introduction," 45-46. See also Fehlner, "Introduction," to *The Triple Way by St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio* (New Bedford, MA: Academy of the Immaculate, 2012),

Bonaventure thereby avoids positing, as Goff puts it, any sort of "external source of determination to the divine being," which would "undermine the true freedom of the divine will."[105] God is *free from* external determination. Fehlner writes well: "He [God] is perfectly necessary being ... because he is immutable. He simply cannot cease to be, to be nothing or from nothing. Hence his action originates not from another, but from himself: *a se* and *per se*."[106] The necessity of immutability, therefore, ultimately secures— as Bonaventure himself explicitly states—God's *summam libertatem*.[107] "For so long as a free agent," remarks Fehlner, "is not perfectly independent and immutable in his essence, i.e. perfectly necessary, so long will his freedom be circumscribed and limited by external compulsions and internal want, and so much the less his own master, i.e. independent."[108]

To conclude this analysis of Bonaventure's teaching on necessity, I highlight briefly the contours of the implicate order that have begun to emerge between freedom and necessity in God. Necessity contains within itself information, as it were, about and internally relates in its metaphysical structure to freedom. In turn, freedom contains information about and internally relates to necessity. Divine freedom unfolds from the very meaning of divine necessity and vice versa. Indeed, in the final analysis, the divine will and divine nature are one and the same thing: the simple Divine Being. "In God," to draw from Fehlner once more, "freedom is perfect and so coincides, as Bonaventure teaches, with metaphysical necessity or personal independence. ... This is because the divine intellect and the divine will are really one, even if they are formally distinct *a parte rei*."[109]

1-94 at 78: "We are accustomed to thinking of necessary and of personal-free as mutually exclusive, because we are accustomed to thinking of necessity merely in terms of violence or of physical motion, rather than metaphysical independence based on immutability."

[105] Goff, *Caritas in Primo*, 268.

[106] Fehlner, "Introduction," 77.

[107] *Myst. Trin*., q. 7, a. 1, resp. (5, 108a).

[108] Fehlner, *The Role of Charity*, 98.

[109] "Scotus and Newman in Dialogue," in *The Newman Scotus Reader: Contexts and Commonalities*, ed. Edward J. Ondrako (New Bedford, MA: Academy of the Immaculate, 2015), 239-389 at 267.

3.2.2 *I Sent.*, d. 6, au., q. 2 (*Myst. Trin.*, q. 7, a. 2): Generation and the Will

The second question of distinction six asks if generation takes place *secundum rationem voluntatis*. Here, Bonaventure makes explicit his theology of the concomitant relationship between nature and will. Given the kind of metaphysical necessity that applies to the divine being, Bonaventure does not reject indiscriminately or in a wholesale way the will in the generation of the Son—even if the Son is generated *per modum naturae*. Such a rejection could undermine divine freedom or even warrant an extrinsic principle of determination. To articulate, however, a role of the will in the generation of the Son, he has to delineate a precise ontology of the will. In particular, he requires a notion of the will that can coordinate with generation—*per modum naturae*—without obfuscating or undermining the fecundity of nature as the chief principle.

To get at such a notion, Bonaventure distinguishes between two different ways of considering *voluntas*.[110] The will can be considered under the aspect of approving and loving (*in ratione approbantis et diligentis*) with respect to every good, whether created or uncreated, or the will can be considered as productive (*in ratione producentis*). In terms of the will as productive, Bonaventure makes further distinctions: it can be a principle distinct from nature—as *accedens* and *antecedens*—or as conjoined to nature.

Once again, however, the *De mysterio Trinitatis* offers a more concise synthesis. There, Bonaventure affirms that the "divine being is both necessary, and yet most free; and that blessed Trinity exists simultaneously (*stat simul*) with necessity and will, if it [the will] is understood according to a fitting mode (*modum convenientem*)."[111] As in the previous article—wherein Bonaventure argued that only a specific account of necessity befits God—so, too, in this article, he avers that not every mode of willing (*modus volendi*) pertains to God. To arrive at the proper mode of willing, Bonaventure distinguishes three types:

---

[110] Cf. Gilles Emery, *La Trinité Créatrice: Trinité et création dans les commentaires aux Sentences de Thomas d'Aquin et de ses précurseurs Albert le Grand et Bonaventure* (Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1995), 191-192.

[111] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 7, a. 2, resp. (5:110b).

-   *voluntas accedens* (or *adveniens*),
-   *voluntas antecedens*, and
-   *voluntas concomitans et acceptans*.[112]

Voluntas accedens. This classification of the will refers to that will-act by which someone from a state of not-willing comes to will something. Obviously, the will as *accedens* does not pertain to God, but only to rational creatures.

Voluntas antecedens. This classification refers to the will insofar as it "precedes the effect in terms of causality and duration."[113] Bonaventure asserts that this mode of willing is in God, "but not with respect to himself, but with respect to the creature, which it precedes in nature and in eternity."[114] This mode of willing does not befit God with respect to himself because "all the divine persons are simultaneous (*sunt simul*)."[115] Consequently, *voluntas antecedens*—while it befits God with respect to creation—does not concern the generation of the Son. Bonaventure's comment, furthermore, that the divine persons are *simul* merits highlighting. The co-eternality of the two emanations ultimately intimates an implicate order between them, inasmuch as they are not two side-by-side separate building blocks. Generation and spiration are "naturally interconnected (*naturaliter coannexae*)."[116] Bonaventure's treatment of the will's concomitant role in the Son's generation pertains to this interconnection: there cannot be one emanation without the other.

Voluntas concomitans et acceptans. In Bonaventure's own words: "This is in God with respect to himself and with respect to the creature; for the divine will approves (*approbat*) and accepts (*acceptat*) every good, whether created or uncreated, whether contingent or necessary."[117] This

---

[112] The classification presented at *I Sent.*, d. 6, au., q. 2, resp. (1:127b-128a) is a bit more complicated, although substantially in agreement with *Myst. Trin.*, q. 7, a. 2.

[113] *I Sent.*, d. 6, au., q. 2, resp. (1:128a).

[114] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 7, a. 2, resp. (5:110b).

[115] *I Sent.*, d. 6, au., q. 2, resp. (1:128a). See also *Myst. Trin.*, q. 6, a. 2, ad 5 (5:105ab).

[116] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 5, a. 2, ad 9 (5:96a).

[117] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 7, a. 2, resp. (5:110b). The *voluntas approbans* of *I Sent.*, d. 6, au., q. 2, resp. equates with the *voluntas acceptans* and *concomitans*. Bonaventure's articulation in the *Myst. Trin.*, however, is tighter and more developed. Specifically, he makes explicit the connection between the *voluntas acceptans* and the will as concomitant; this correspondence is not as clearly delineated in *I Sent.*

notion of the will does not marginalize the necessity of immutability. Rather, there is a harmony. The *voluntas acceptans* is utterly accepting of the infinite goodness constitutive of divine life. It "underlies the mystery of the Trinity," writes Fehlner.[118]

Without veering into too great a digression, I now explicate, albeit briefly, this harmony between the *voluntas acceptans* and divine necessity.[119] Doing so will further illuminate the implicate order between freedom and necessity, and so ultimately between generation and spiration—the main point of concern, to which I will return shortly.

In the *De mysterio Trinitatis*, having arrived at the *voluntas acceptans*, Bonaventure shows how this conception of the will harmonizes with the conception of divine necessity:

> I say *voluntas acceptans* on behalf of the highest charity in the one producing and the highest goodness in the product, which both necessarily include in themselves the *voluntas complacentiae*; but the *necessitas incommutabilitatis* is on behalf of the indifference of essence (*indifferentiam essentiae*) and independence of person (*independentiam personae*). For because the essence is altogether indifferent [i.e., identical] with respect to the three persons, there is therefore one quiddity or entity, one truth, and for this reason one necessity. For since the first person is from himself (*a se ipsa*), he is altogether necessary, and for this reason the second and the third person are also.[120]

In this pithy passage, Bonaventure outlines the basic contours of the synergy between divine necessity and freedom. To put it succinctly: the divine will—*voluntas acceptans*—is totally accepting of the intrinsic—necessary—goodness constitutive of triune life.[121]

The intrinsic productivity of persons is the realization of highest charity and goodness, which the *voluntas acceptans* freely accepts. This intrinsic

---

[118] Fehlner, *The Role of Charity*, 99.

[119] Any kind of an explication that would eliminate any tension or offer a complete and exhaustive analysis is impossible: this harmony ultimately equates with the infinity mystery that is the Triune God.

[120] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 7, a. 2, resp. (5:111a).

[121] Bonaventure's response to a contrary argument is also quite relevant in this regard. The contrary argument suggests that an agent which dominates over its actions is more noble than one who does not. Therefore, an emanation that is necessary does not befit the Trinity. To respond, Bonaventure argues that the argument works if the action is distinct from the agent. In the Trinity, though, act and agent are not distinct. See *Myst. Trin.*, q. 7, a. 2, ad 2 (5:111b).

productivity also manifests the necessity of immutability because the essence, which entirely lacks an extrinsic principle of determination, is identical to the persons: hence the persons are necessary.[122] The Father communicates *aseity*, which bespeaks the intrinsic necessity of immutability, to the other persons. This *aseity* safeguards the divine persons from any extrinsic principle of determination. Fehlner writes well:

> Independent existence, *aseitas*, personal being, and the essentially free character of the perfect will are identical in God. ... By necessity of immutability and independence, he [Bonaventure] means "personal independence" ..., the apex of aseity, not "natural necessity" so typical of *natural* action when contrasted with the *voluntary*. ... This independence as the formal perfection of the will is really identical with the essential immutability and necessity of divine being.[123]

The necessity of immutability manifests God's freedom: God is totally independent. In turn, the *voluntas acceptans* accepts the goodness of divine life that manifests the necessity of immutability because it is not determined from any extrinsic principle.[124] "The creaturely categories," as Hayes observes, "are transcended in the dialectical unity of the necessity of immutability with the accompanying and approving will."[125]

In God, says Bonaventure, necessity and will are thereby *simul*: "necessity with the will, and will with necessity."[126] Indeed, Bonaventure's insistence on the indifference of the divine essence unites nature and will.

---

[122] "Again, whatever is indifferent to what is supremely necessary, is entirely necessary; but the whole Trinity is the divine essence." *Myst. Trin.*, q. 7, a. 2, fund. 6 (5:110b).

[123] Fehlner, "Scotus and Newman in Dialogue," 267 (emphasis in original).

[124] Perhaps a couple of alternatives will help to clarify this interaction. It is not the case that God, in a first moment is the Divine Essence, and then in a second moment *wills* to communicate himself so that trinitarian plurality results. Nor is it the case that God in a first moment is the Divine Essence, and then in a second moment *necessarily*—because determined by some extrinsic principle—communicates himself. Nor is it the case that God is in a first moment personally three and then, in a second moment, God decides to accept this reality (or not). None of these scenarios do justice to the harmony sought after by Bonaventure. To put it as concisely as I can: The divine essence is infinitely good. It is not, however, infinitely good because it is determined by something else to be infinitely good. As infinitely good, the divine essence is infinitely communicative—and three is the number of infinity. The divine *voluntas acceptans* is totally accepting of this goodness. This acceptance, even if necessary, is not forced: it is immutably free. See also *II Sent.*, d. 24, p. 1, a. 1, q. 1 (2:554-556) and d. 25, p. 2, au., q. 2 (2:612-613).

[125] Hayes, "Introduction," 46.

[126] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 7, a. 2, resp. (5:111a).

Divine *necessitas* and *voluntas* thus ultimately insinuate the tandem interplay between generation and spiration.

Aware of the obvious difficulties of attempting to spell out the complicated harmony between necessity and freedom, I return now to the more pressing matter at hand: the relationship between generation and spiration. How does Bonaventure describe this relationship?

The tandem interplay between generation and spiration pivots on the way in which nature and will concomitantly correlate as productive principles. Bonaventure developed a complex ontology of willing precisely because he needed to arrive at a notion of the will as concomitant.

Briefly put, as conjoined principles of production, either nature or will is the chief principle of production and the other is concomitant. Accordingly, while *natura* is *producens principaliter* in the generation of the Son, the will is nonetheless concomitant: it approvingly accompanies the generation. Bonaventure puts it as follows:

> If the will is the principle—with the nature being concomitant (*concomitante natura*)—then there is the procession of the Holy Spirit, who proceeds through the mode of love, but nevertheless similar in nature. But if nature is the chief (*primum*) principle—with the will being concomitant (*concomitante voluntate*)—then there is the generation of the Son, who is produced altogether similar and through the mode of nature, but nevertheless as beloved (*ut dilectus*); and therefore it is said, that the Father is pleased in him (*sibi in eo complacet*).[127]

This passage reveals the implicate order of the emanations. As alluded to above, the generation of the Son *ut dilectus* implies the spiration of the Spirit *per modum amoris*. Similarly, the reference to the Father "pleased in" the Son recalls a passage from Bonaventure's *Commentarius in Evangelium S.*

---

[127] *I Sent.*, d. 6, au., q. 2, resp. (1:128a). Bonaventure's ways of classifying the will carries forward the tradition of the *Summa Halensis*. See in particular *SH* I, n. 301, ad 2 (1: 434b-435a): "Therefore it should be said that the Father does not beget the Son by a conditional will (*voluntate conditionali*), nor by the will simply which is indeed the preceding or adventitious (*praecedens vel accedens*), because neither did the Father will before that he would beget, nor did a new will come to him so that he would beget, nor did some exterior cause draw him or impel him so that he would generate a Son, but he begot [the Son] by a will in an absolutely concomitant manner (*voluntate absoluta concomitante*), so that the sense is this: by will [the Father] begot the Son, that is the will is concomitant with the generation of the Son." Bonaventure advances the *Summa Halensis*' treatment in his own development of the will as *acceptans et concomitans*.

77

Lucae—also discussed above. There, Bonaventure specified that the Father is well pleased in the Son "on behalf of (*propter*) the most perfect *nexum* of love"—the Spirit—between them.[128]

In this regard, also significant is a response to an opposing argument from the *De mysterio Trinitatis*:

> To that which is objected, namely that production is, in God, either by necessity or by the will; we should say, that ... there [in God] it [production] is in a certain way by necessity and in a certain way by the will. For it is not through the necessity of coaction (*coactionis*), but of immutability; not through the choosing will (*eligentem*), but through the will that is ever accepting (*sempiternaliter acceptantem*), *according to which the one producing takes pleasure* (*sibi complacet*) *and delights* (*delectatur*) *in* the most noble production.[129]

The necessity of immutability does not constrain God. Likewise, God does not deliberate and then choose to generate or spirate. Something else entirely takes place. There is a kind of necessity: intrinsic necessity. God is independent. There is also a kind of will: *voluntas acceptans*. The divine will accepts goodness eternally—immutably and hence freely. Ultimately, then, the Father who generates the Son *per modum naturae* takes pleasure and delights in the Son. He takes pleasure in the Son because the will is not absent in the natural generation of the Son, and the Father-Son relationship does not exclude—but rather implicates—the Spirit, "the perfect *nexum* of love between them."

Consequently, the will as concomitant plays a role in the Son's generation. To use Bohm's language, an *internal relationship* thereby constitutes the concomitance of nature and will, generation and spiration.

By way of synthesis: nature and will, as the principles of generation and spiration, implicate one another. The generation of the Son and the spiration of the Holy Spirit do not constitute separate building blocks of the divine life. Enfolded within the very mystery of generation—wherein nature is the chief productive principle—is the accompanying divine will approving and accepting of every good. Consequently, the Son's very identity and the

---

[128] See n73 above.
[129] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 6, a. 2, ad 6 (5:105b), emphasis mine.

mystery of generation itself entails or implicates the third divine person. The Son is generated *ut dilectus*. Without spiriation, generation remains incomplete.[130]

3.2.3 The Son's Priority and Implicate Order

I conclude this subsection regarding the concomitance of generation and spiration with a brief word about the Son's "priority." As I have already stressed, Bonaventure denies any sort of priority or posteriority in God, especially insofar as it would connote any kind of temporal before and after. The persons and emanations are *simul*. Nonetheless, his theology of *ordo* and his emphasis on origin does permit a certain sense of "priority." The Son is "prior" to the Holy Spirit insofar as he is principle with the Father of the Spirit.[131] In other words, rather than connoting a chronological succession of the divine persons, the divine *ordo* refers to the very trinitarian life—based on the order of personal origins—of the three-personed God. The kind of "priority" that obtains in God thus concerns the personal order of origin. The question I ask here is: How might the theology of the concomitant— implicate—relationship between generation and spiration thus far developed apply to the Son's priority?

When Bonaventure asks whether generation is prior to spiration *secundum rationem intelligendi*, a contrary argument holds that, in the created image, appetite precedes knowledge. That is, we first desire to think of something and then, afterwards, the thought is born.[132] So, in God, the argument concludes, spiration should precede generation. Bonaventure's response is insightful. He distinguishes two different ways (*duplicem statum*) to consider "appetite":

> In one way, [appetite is considered] according to the reason of desiring (*secundum rationem inhiantis*), [and thus] before the knowledge is acquired. In another way, [appetite is considered] according to the

---

[130] See n134 below.

[131] *I Sent.*, d. 12, au., q. 4, resp. (1:225b). Regarding Bonaventure's denial of "priority" or "posterity" in God, see my comments at the end of Section 1.3 of this chapter, as well as n127 in the following chapter.

[132] *I Sent.*, d. 12, au., q. 4, opp. 1 (1:225a).

reason of embracing (*secundum rationem complectentis*), and this is after (*post*) the knowledge is acquired. In the first case (*statum*) there is imperfection; but in the second case, there is perfection (*est perfectionis*). And therefore, since we attribute to God that which pertains to perfection, not that which pertains to imperfection, appetite in the second mode is assimilated to the Holy Spirit, and here it has the reason of the third (*rationem tertii*).[133]

The perfect act of generation, which, in a qualified manner, is "prior" to spiration, nonetheless implicates spiration. Emanation of the Word implicates the third person, the *ratio tertii*. As the *ratio tertii*, the Holy Spirit perfects the whole emanative dynamic of triune life as the completive term of embracing Love, in whom "there is perfection." The *complectens* is *completens*: the finality of the Holy Spirit is embracing, perfective love. Indeed, the emanation of the Word is not perfect without the emanation of Love: "There is not perfect knowledge (*cognitio*) without love (*dilectione*), therefore neither a perfect word without love (*amore*): therefore neither a perfect emanation of the Word without the emanation of Love. Therefore it is necessary to posit an emanation through the mode of love (*per modum amoris*)."[134]

Bonaventure makes substantially the same point in the *De mysterio Trinitatis*. There, he argues that the Father does not produce the Son in a first act and then the Spirit in a second, posterior act. Rather, spiration is *simul cum Filio*. The emanations are not in opposition to one another; they are inherently connected. "The generation of the Word proceeding from the mind does not impede (*impedit*) the spiration of love embracing both (*amoris complectentis utrumque*)."[135]

Therefore, the priority of the Son is not the priority of a mechanistic system. The Son is not a trinitarian building block more primitive than the building block of spiration. For this reason, the notion of "implicate order" is quite helpful: enfolded within the very significance of the Son's generation is the mystery of spiration. Generation and spiration implicate one another:

---

[133] *I Sent.*, d. 12, au., q. 4, ad 1 (1:226a). The first way connotes imperfection "because it belongs to the ignorant and desirous to acquire knowledge. This does not befit (*non convenit*) God."

[134] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 2, fund. 1 (1:197a).

[135] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 5, a. 2, ad 9 (5:96b).

Spiration grants a pre-understanding (*dat praeintelligere*) of generation—for they are not connected (*nectuntur*) unless they are distinct and similar, and thus those of whom one is from the other through generation. Similarly, generation consequently grants an understanding (*dat intelligere*) of spiration. For it is necessary that those who are distinct and altogether similar [i.e., the Father and the Son] be conjoined (*coniungi*) through delightful (*deliciosum*) love [i.e., the Holy Spirit].[136]

Enfolded within the mystery of spiration is generation because the Spirit as *nexus* connects those whom are distinct and similar; thus, it implies the Father's generative emanation of the Son—who is distinct and yet similar to the Father. Enfolded within the mystery of generation is spiration because the Son and the Father are conjoined through the love of the Spirit. Generation does not result in mere distinction: it is inextricably linked to the unitive mystery of spiration.

3.3 *Epilogue: Perichoretic Persons*

As Luc Mathieu asserts, Bonaventure is one of the first Latin theologians to adopt John Damascene's use of *circumincessio*—the Latin translation of the Greek περιχώρησις—in trinitarian theology.[137] In brief, the term expresses the way in which the three divine hypostases are in one another, yet in such a way that there is essential unity and hypostatic distinction. The term does not yet appear in Alexander of Hales,[138] and St. Thomas does not adopt it. Bonaventure, however, welcomes the term and it coheres well with his trinitarian theology. He incorporates it already in his *Commentarius in Librum Sententiarum*.[139] In the *Itinerarium*, the term indicates the "co-intimacy" of the divine persons.[140] And in the *Hexaemeron*, Bonaventure fleshes out a remarkable perichoretic theology of the divine

---

[136] *I Sent.*, d. 13, au., q. 3, resp. (1:236b).

[137] See Mathieu, "Circumincessio," 33-34. For references regarding the theology of *circumincessio/ perichoresis* in general and in Bonaventure see n40 in Chapter One above.

[138] Interestingly, however, the *Summa Halensis* does use the term as a verb to describe the interrelationship between the one, the true, and the good: "istae intentiones … se circumincedunt." *SH* I, n. 73 (1:116a). I discuss these three concepts, which anticipate the development of the transcendentals in medieval thought, in Section 1.2 of the following chapter.

[139] See *I Sent.*, d. 19, p. 1, au., q. 4 (1:347-350).

[140] See *Itin.*, 6.2 (5:310b-311a).

persons, which ultimately penetrates into his angelology, ecclesiology, and anthropology.[141] While avoiding too great a digression that would offer a thorough presentation of Bonaventure's theology of *circumincessio*, the goal of this brief subsection is to suggest how the *circumincessio* of the divine persons substantiates and illuminates the theology of implicate order developed thus far. I here focus on Bonaventure's discussion of *circumincessio* as articulated in the *Hexaemeron*.

At the beginning of the 21st collation, Bonaventure refers to the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit as the "eternal sun."[142] The Father is supremely vigorous (*summe vigens*), the Son supremely shining (*summe fulgens*), and the Spirit supremely warming (*summe calens*); the Father is most vigorous light (*lux vigentissima*), the Son most beautiful and shining splendor (*splendor pulcherrimus et fulgentissimus*), and the Spirit most burning heat (*calor ardentissimus*). There is distinction and yet unity, as there are not three suns. This metaphor prepares for Bonaventure's theology of *circumincessio*:

> And just as vigor (*vigor*) is splendid (*splendens*) and warming (*calens*), splendor is vigorous (*vigens*) and warming, and heat (*calor*) is vigorous and splendid in that visible sun; so the Father is in himself and in the Son and in the Holy Spirit, and the Son is in the Father and in himself and in the Holy Spirit, and the Holy Spirit is in the Father and in the Son and in himself according to the *ratio circumincessionis*, which indicates identity with distinction.[143]

Each person exists in the other persons. Bonaventure takes such in-existence quite seriously. He goes on to elucidate a theology of the persons that does not prescind from their perichoretic constitution.

To do this, Bonaventure identifies the Trinity as originating principle, governing center, and final completion.[144] These three descriptors apply to the whole Trinity in relation to the economy and yet also refer, as

---

[141] See *Hex.*, 21-22 (5:431-444).
[142] *Hex.*, 21.2 (5:431ab). Cf. John Damascene, *De Fide Orthodoxa*, 8.18 (ed. Eligius M. Buytaert [St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 1955], 47-48).
[143] *Hex.*, 21.2 (5:431b).
[144] *Hex.*, 21.4 (5:432a).

appropriations, to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit respectively.[145] Bonaventure then perichoretically charges, as it were, each of these appropriations. So, in the case of the Father for instance, the Father—as perichoretic—exists in the Son and in Spirit. This perichoretic in-existence of the Father applies also to the Father as originating principle. Accordingly, enfolded within this appropriation—"originating principle"—is another set of appropriations: power, wisdom, and will. These three, in turn, map on to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit respectively. Bonaventure provides a similar analysis in terms of the Son as "governing center" and the Spirit as "beatifying end" (*beatificativus*).

After this analysis, Bonaventure offers a kind of concluding appendix. The Trinity as originating principle, governing center, and final completion "must be exerting power with supreme height (*summa celsitudine pollens*), presiding with supreme strength (*summa fortitudine praesidens*), and feeding with supreme sweetness (*summa dulcedine pascens*)."[146] Herein lies another set of appropriations. Bonaventure unfolds the perichoretic nuance. As *summe pollens*, the Father must be holy (*sanctus*), wise (*sapiens*), and stable (*stabilis*). Consequently, enfolded within the appropriation of *summe pollens* is another set of—perichoretic—appropriations: stability refers to the Father as he is in himself, wisdom to the Father as he is in the Son, and holiness to the Father as he is in the Holy Spirit.[147] Bonaventure offers a similar analysis in terms of *summa praesidens* and *summa pascens*:

- The Son as *summa praesidens* entails authority (= the Son in the Father), virility (= the Son in himself), and is triumphant (= the Son in the Spirit).[148]
- The Spirit as *summa pascens* entails leading (= the Spirit in the Father), instructing (= the Spirit in the Son), and guarding (= the Spirit in himself).[149]

---

[145] Given the overall scope of this project concerning the finality of the Spirit, I point out here that the governing center, in effect, governs for the sake of some finality. The *medium* that governs culminates in the finality of the Spirit.

[146] *Hex*., 21.12 (5:433b).

[147] See *Hex*., 21.13 (5:433b)

[148] See *Hex*., 21.14 (5:433b).

[149] See *Hex*., 21.15 (5:433b).

The Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit exist in themselves and in one another. Such a robust perichoretic theology of the Holy Trinity coheres well with the idea of implicate order: perichoretic in-existence refers to the way in which each person is enfolded within the other persons, and so to the way in which each person unfolds from the very mystery of the other.

4. Bonaventure on the *filioque*

I now turn to Bonaventure's theology of the *filioque*, namely, the teaching that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. It is not my intention, however, to offer here a detailed history of the *filioque* or to enter into the polemics of the debate.[150] The objective of this section is much more modest. In what follows, I touch upon select features of Bonaventure's theology of the *filioque* in order to underscore the pneumatological nuance of the Son's personal identity, as well as the Spirit's completive role within triune life in general.

---

[150] Regarding studies of the *filioque* in general, see Lucas Francisco Mateo-Seco, "The Paternity of the Father and the Procession of the Holy Spirit: Some Historical Remarks on the Ecumenical Problem," in *Rethinking Trinitarian Theology: Disputed Questions and Contemporary Issues in Trinitarian Theology*, eds. Giulio Maspero and Robert Woźniak (London: T&T Clark, 2012), 69-102; Elena Álvarez, *Procede del Padre y del Hijo: Estudio de la* Clarificación Romana *de 1995 y de sus fuentes patrísticas* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2011), especially the first chapter, which provides a historical introduction to the *filioque*; Edward Siecienski, *The Filioque: History of a Doctrinal Controversy* (Oxford: Oxford University, 2010); Brian Daley, "Revisiting the 'Filioque': Roots and Branches of an Old Debate. Part One," *Pro Ecclesia: A Journal of Catholic and Evangelical Theology* 10 (2001): 31-62; Leo Scheffczyk, "The Meaning of the 'Filioque,'" *Communio: International Catholic Review* 13 (1986): 125-138. Given St. Anselm's particular importance to the medieval development of this debate, see also Sergio Bonanni, "Il 'Filioque' tra dialettica e dialogo. Anselmo e Abelardo: posizioni a confronto," *Lateranum* 64 (1998): 49-79; Andrea Milano, "Anselmo d'Aosta e il problema trinitario," in *Il Concilio di Bari del 1098. Atti del convegno storico internazionale e celebrazioni del IX centenario del concilio*, eds. Salvatore Palese and Giancarlo Locatelli (Bari: Edipuglia, 1999), 187-229. Although literature on Bonaventure's theology of the *filioque* is limited, see Orlando Todisco, "Il platonismo di Bessarione e di Bonaventura. Riflessi nella vicenda del 'Filioque,'" *Miscellanea Francescana* 119 (2019): 9-42; Oliver Herbel, "Ratramnus of Corbie, Paulinus of Aquileia, and Aeneas of Paris as Sources for Bonaventure's *Filioque* Arguments in the *Sentences*," *Franciscan Studies* 65 (2007): 87-105.

4.1 *Filioque and the Spirit as Nexus*

As has already been noted, the Holy Spirit's identity as *nexus* is key to Bonaventure's pneumatology.[151] Not surprisingly, then, his theology of *nexus* plays a significant role in his explication of the *filioque*.

One of the arguments Bonaventure puts forth in his treatment of the *filioque* at *I Sent.*, d. 11 relies precisely on the meaning of "nexus." He makes a distinction between *nexus* as *medium* and *nexus* as *extremum*. A *nexus* is either a "*medium* joining (*iungens*) one to another," or "an *extremum*, in which they are conjoined (*in quo coniunguntur*)." The Holy Spirit, who "proceeds as *nexum* and communion," proceeds in the second sense of *nexus*, i.e., as an *extremum*.[152] Thus, the Spirit, as *nexus*, is the extreme point of convergence (*extremum*) in whom the Father and the Son are united.

Bonaventure applies this distinction between *nexus*-as-*medium* and *nexus*-as-*extremum* to one of the contrary arguments. It had argued that the Spirit as *nexus* cannot proceed from both the Father and the Son because to be *nexus* is to be *medium*, but to proceed from both would mean that the Spirit does not have the *ratio medii*, but the *ratio tertii et extremi*.[153] To respond, Bonaventure asserts that the Spirit does not have the *rationem medii*, but rather the *rationem tertii*.[154] The opposing argument understood *nexus* only as *medium*. As the *ratio tertii—ratio finiendi*!—the Spirit is the terminal, binding *nexus* of the first two divine persons.

Furthermore, Bonaventure avers that a *nexus* is more perfect when it proceeds from both terms than if it proceeds from only one of the two. Although he does not elaborate why that is the case, the unsaid reason seems clear enough: insofar as a *nexus* is the union consequent to distinction, then it is stronger if its source is from both distinct members than from just one of the two. "Therefore, if the Holy Spirit is the most perfect *nexus*, not only does

---

[151] My discussion here of Bonaventure's theology of *nexus* anticipates a more thorough analysis in the following chapter.
[152] *I Sent.*, d. 11, au., q. 1, resp. (1:211b-212a).
[153] *I Sent.*, d. 11, au., q. 1, opp. 3 (1:209b).
[154] *I Sent.*, d. 11, au., q. 1, ad 3 (1:213a).

[the Spirit] proceed from the Father, but also from the Son."[155] Bonaventure's theology of *nexus* thus goes hand in hand with his theology of the *filioque*.

The successive question asks if the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son *ab uno principio*. Bonaventure's theology of *nexus* emerges also here. According to one of the contrary arguments, the Holy Spirit cannot proceed from the Father and the Son as one principle precisely because the Holy Spirit is their *nexus*: "Again, that which proceeds from two things—insofar as they are distinct—proceeds from two things insofar as they are two; but a *nexus* is only of things that are distinct: therefore, that which proceeds as a *nexus* proceeds from them as distinct things, and thus as from different things." [156]

Bonaventure responds:

> It should be said that the nature (*ratio*) of a *nexus* begins from distinction and tends or leads into unity (*tendit sive perducit in unitatem*): whence the ultimate and completive meaning (*ultima et completiva ratio*) is unity. Therefore although a *nexus* is of two things and from two things, if it is a perfect *nexus*, it is from them insofar as they are one."[157]

The personal distinction of Father and Son is coupled with a perfect harmony between them. This harmony of will constitutes the single principle of spiration.[158] Yet, this harmony does not obfuscate their personal distinction: there is one *principium* of spiration but two subjects who spirate (*spiratores*). Ultimately, then, in the Spirit, their personal distinction finds a kind of perichoretic unity.[159] To speak of the finality of the Holy Spirit is thus to speak of ultimate union: "the ultimate and completive meaning is unity." The Father

---

[155] *I Sent.*, d. 11, au., q. 1, fund. 3 (1:210b).

[156] *I Sent.*, d. 11, au., q. 2, opp. 2 (1:215a).

[157] *I Sent.*, d. 11, au., q. 2, ad 2 (1:216a).

[158] For Bonaventure, the Father and the Son are one principle of the Holy Spirit because in them there is one fecundity of the will; the Spirit proceeds from them "in quantum sunt unum." *I Sent.*, d. 11, au., q. 2, resp. (1:215b). Hayes ("The Doctrine of the Spirit in the Early Writings of St. Bonaventure," 181) writes: "So intimately are the Father and Son united that the Spirit proceeds *ab una fecunditate voluntatis*. Or, in another context, the Spirit is described as the *nexus* between the Father and the Son. This ... should not be taken to mean that the Spirit actively gives something to the Father and the Son. On the contrary, the Spirit is the bond by proceeding from out of the concord of their mutual love, or from their common spiration."

[159] Hence Christ's prayer "that they may be one" (Jn 17:11 and 22) is a prayer for the *unitas caritatis*, namely, the Holy Spirit. See Section 3.3 in the next chapter.

and the Son come together in the unitive *nexus* of the Spirit. Hellmann's analysis of Bonaventure's theology of *nexus* is helpful:

> First of all and quite simply, the *nexus* is not the *medium*. What is the precise difference? The difference is their position in the divine order of origin. The Son is the *medium*, and as the *medium*, he effects the unity of the Father and the Spirit; here the emphasis is on the distinction proper to that unity. In the Spirit another aspect becomes clearer. The Spirit is the *nexus* of the Father and Son; here differences are not manifested, rather, they are resolved. ... The *medium* points to the distinction, but the *nexus* speaks of unity, and both reveal the divine order. Thus Bonaventure can write that the Spirit proceeds *per Filium* in which he points to the two extremes of the Father and the Spirit, and he can simultaneously say that the Spirit proceeds from both (*ab utroque*) in which he stresses the unity of the divine order in so far as the Spirit is the *nexus* of the Father and the Son. The *nexus* is the perfection of *mediatio*. That is, the *nexus* begins in *mediatio* where there is distinction, but it is completed where there is perfect unity.[160]

The Spirit thus plays a key role in the Father-Son relationship: the Father and the Son's connection lies in the Spirit. They are one in their fecundity of will in spirating the Spirit; and in the Spirit they are united in the loving *nexus* of divine life. Leo Scheffczyk, while not commenting on Bonaventure, arrives at a fitting conclusion:

> The *Filioque* expresses not only the Son's vital relationship of origin to the Spirit, which without its introduction would remain unilluminated, but exhibits before that the personal communion of the Father and the Son. It makes clear that the generation of the Son as Word of the Father brings forth an assimilation and communion between Father and Son which *perfects itself* in mutual love.[161]

The Son's very relationship to the Father does not exclude, but rather implicates the third person of the Holy Trinity. The most perfect *nexus*—the Holy Spirit—binds together Father and Son. Bonaventure's theology of the *filioque* accentuates that the Son is not the Son without the Spirit, and that the personal distinction between Father and Son is brought together in "completive union" in the Holy Spirit.

---

[160] Hellmann, *Divine and Created Order*, 78-79.
[161] Scheffczyk, "The Meaning of the 'Filioque,'" 137 (emphasis mine).

4.2 *The Expressive Son*

Above, I had discussed how the Son, as *Imago*, implies the Son's co-spiration of the Holy Spirit. There is no need to discuss at length this aspect anew. I want only to point out that, when Bonaventure discusses the *filioque*, his theology of the second person as *imago* plays a role:

> Again, more perfect (*perfectior*) is the expression (*expressio*), when the one generating communicates to the one begotten not only substance, but also act, which is not repugnant (*non repugnat*) to the nature of the begotten; but the act of spirating is not repugnant to the Son, because nothing inconvenient (*inconveniens*) follows from this, [i.e.] if [the Son] spirates. Therefore, if the Father does not communicate this act to him, then the Son is not a perfect image.[162]

The Son—perfect expression of the Father, source of the divinity—spirates with the Father the Holy Spirit. Divine sonship, one might say, expresses itself as an imitative likeness of the Father. Truly: "Whoever sees me, sees the Father" (Jn 14:9). In the spiration of the Spirit, the Son's imaginal expressiveness realizes itself infinitely and eternally: it is more perfect (*perfectior*). That is, as Image, the second person is co-origin of the Spirit and by co-spirating the Spirit, the second person realizes his imitative likeness to the Father. In the Spirit lies the perfection of the second person's expression of the Father.

4.3 *The Son as Medium*

After his discussion of the *filioque* in *I Sent.*, d. 11, Bonaventure continues to investigate the procession of the Holy Spirit in distinction 12. Relevant here is third question of that distinction: "Whether the Holy Spirit by the Son's mediation (*mediante Filio*) proceeds from the Father?"[163] Following Richard of St. Victor, Bonaventure holds that the "production (*productio*) of the Holy Spirit" is mediated insofar as it is from the Son but immediate insofar as it from the Father.[164]

---

[162] *I Sent.*, d. 11, au., q. 1, fund. 6 (1:210b-211a).
[163] *I Sent.*, d. 12, au., q. 3 (1:223).
[164] *I Sent.*, d. 12, au., q. 3, resp. (1:223b).

Bonaventure develops this position in one of his responses to a contrary argument, wherein he relates the Son's mediation to his theology of divine order. The argument to which he needs to respond is: since an immediate principle is more noble than a mediating principle, and only what is most noble should be attributed to God, then we should not attribute a mediating principle to God.[165] To respond, Bonaventure distinguishes between three kinds of mediation:

- Mediation 1: excludes immediacy altogether. This kind of mediation obtains when a final effect is not connected to the influence of a prior cause, but is produced only through the medium, without the cooperation of the prior cause. "This bespeaks order, diversity of agents and separation."[166]
- Mediation 2: bespeaks an order of causes mutually related. This kind of mediation involves order and a diversity of agents; but unlike the first kind there is not separation in acting.
- Mediation 3: bespeaks order, but unlike the first two there is no separation of power or diversity of agents.

Bonaventure makes these distinctions in order to pick out a mode of mediation that applies to divine life. The distinctions become clearer as he continues his analysis:

> The first mediation does not take place in God, because God is simply the first cause, whose influence is so great that no creature does anything irrespective of its influence (*eius influentia remota*). ... The second mediation takes place in God with respect to effects produced by a created cause, because there is an order of causes and a diversity of power: but there is not, however, separation, because God acts intimately (*intime*), because through himself (*quia per se ipsum*); he acts, nevertheless, through created power, which is from him. The third mediation takes place in the divine operation (*operatione divina*), in which the agents are the persons in whom order is present (*attenditur ordo*), because one has from the other what it does (*una habet ab alia quod agat*). Yet, there is neither a diversity of power nor separation nor any distance. Rather they act by one power and equally intimately (*una*

---

[165] *I Sent.*, d. 12, au., q. 3, opp. 1 (1:223ab).
[166] *I Sent.*, d. 12, au., q. 3, ad 1 (1:224a).

virtute et aeque intime agunt). And as such does the Father *mediante Filio* produce the Holy Spirit, not because there is a medium of distance or of difference, but because, what the Son produces, this he has from the Father (*a Patre*), in such a way that there is a certain order.[167]

In this passage, Bonaventure puts forth a theory of mediation that overcomes separation and excludes diversity of power. He proffers a version of mediation centered on order and thereby the Son's centrality.

Accordingly, the procession of the Spirit—insofar as it involves the Son's mediation—does not entail any distance or separation between the Father and the Spirit. The Son's mediation does not facilitate the Father's act of spiration, nor does it wedge into the divine life any sort of space between the first and the third divine person. Rather, to say that the Son mediates the procession of the Spirit is to accent the primacy of the Father and the Son's own origin from him. Hence mediation speaks to the order of divine life. Ultimately, mediation manifests that the Son takes part in the very life of the Father: "what the Son produces, this he has from the Father."

Furthermore, this mediation, unlike the first two kinds, is not in opposition to immediacy. The Son's mediation does not prolong or delay spiration, but manifests the intimacy of the Father and the Son. Trinitarian order entails the Son's centrality, and thus his mediation and the procession of the Spirit from both the Father and the Son.[168] The Son in the life of the *ordo perfectus* is the mediating center (*medium*), which *medium* he would not be if he did not share personally in the life of the Father, if he did not act "by one power … intimately" with the Father.[169]

Without the Spirit, and ultimately without the *filioque* as Bonaventure understands it, the Son is not who he is because he is not the center of divine life.

---

[167] *I Sent.*, d. 12, au., q. 3, ad 1 (1:224ab). See Hellmann, *Divine and Created Order*, 64-66.

[168] Engaging with Bonaventure's thought, Amaury Begasse de Dhaem writes that the second person as *medium* "implica il *filioque* come fondamento di una relazione veramente trinitaria, manifestata nella processione dello Spirito." "Gesù Cristo, mistero trinitario," in *La Trinità in dialogo. La dimensione trinitaria della teologia*, eds. Sergio Paolo Bonanni and Dariusz Kowalczyk (Roma: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2020), 45-60 at 49.

[169] See n167.

5. Conclusion: The *Medium* and the *Ultimum*

5.1 *Centrality as Centrifugal*

The second person of the Holy Trinity is the *persona media*. For the Seraphic Doctor, the significance of this middle position does not lie in being numerically second in a chronological sequence or spatial arrangement. Rather, the centerpoint of the Holy Trinity expresses the whole dynamic of triune love: the Son is both origin ($\rightarrow$ Father) and originated ($\rightarrow$ Holy Spirit). As center, the Son is the mediation of fontal plenitude and the finality of mutual love: a mirror of the primordial *fons* of the Father and the most perfect *nexus* of the Spirit, love given and love received. In the center, the gaze of the contemplative eye catches a glimpse of the infinite and intimate exchange of perichoretic mystery.

The centrality of the second person reveals itself as utterly centrifugal, unable to remain ensconced within itself because it is utterly *medium*. In the Holy Trinity, the mediating center offers an eternal prefiguration of the cross that reaches outward on both sides. Not centripetal, but centrifugal: the personal center of the Trinity conveys the heterotelic pulse of the Father's *primitas* by breathing forth with the Father the Spirit, the breath of love embracing both.

Thus the *persona media* is simply not without the Father or the Spirit. The whole meaning of *medium*—and so trinitarian order—perishes if the *medium* is not touching both extremes. Similarly, the Father and the Son are not the first and the second without the *ratio tertii*: binding fruit of their fecundity.

5.2 *Word, Image, and Son: Pneumatological Nuances*

For Bonaventure, the three traditional titles of the second person all include reference to the Holy Spirit. The Son emits directionality not only toward the Father but also toward the Spirit.

91

As "Word," the second person is utterly expressive of the Father who speaks. In this Word, the Father expresses all things: the Word is the exemplar of all that is. Ultimately, the Word is expressive of the Father even as *principium principians*. To express the Father in this way is to spirate with the Father the Holy Spirit. To sever the Word from the Spirit is to diminish the primordial expression of the Father inasmuch as it is to diminish the Word as *similitudinem expressivam*.

As "Image," the second person is imitative of the Father. The second person is *expressio in summo*. To realize this imitative expression of the Father, the Son imitates in such wise that he is intimately involved in the Father's production of the third divine person. Bonaventure's theology of the second person as Image involves explicitly the way in which the second person relates "to the one from whom he is" *and* "to the one who is from him."[170]

Lastly, the title "Son" captures the intimate relationship the second person shares with the Father. Significantly, though, it is not just that the Son comes from the Father, but that the Son is *beloved* by the Father. The Son is *dilectus*. This term implicates the Spirit. The *beloved* Son of the Father does not exclude, but indicates the *unitas caritatis* that is the Spirit—the most perfect *nexus* of Love.

5.3 *The Implicate Order of Emanations*

Enfolded within the very identity of the Son thus lies the mystery of the Holy Spirit. Indeed, the eternal act of generation implicates—is concomitant with—the eternal act of spiration. Generation and spiration do not form unitary building blocks that can be arranged alongside one another. Rather, these modes of emanation relate internally to one another: there cannot be one without the other. Enfolded within generation is the mystery of spiration as concomitant; enfolded within spiration is the mystery of generation as concomitant. The Son is never *not* the "beloved Son": he is eternally generated *ut dilectus*.

---

[170] *I Sent.*, d. 31, p. 2, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (1:542ab)—see n67 above.

This implicate order of divine life coheres well with the theology of *perichoresis*. In Bonaventure, to speak of *perichoresis*/*circumincessio* is to speak about the *cointimitas* of the persons, an intimacy so fundamental to their distinct identities that it is impossible to sever them from one another. A perichoretic theology, moreover, cannot but be especially pneumatological: the whole language of union and distinction—characteristic of *circumincessio*—is also characteristic of the Spirit as *unitas caritatis* and *nexus*. Amaury Begasse de Dhaem hints at this similarity:

> God's being as one ... pronounces itself as a being in one another, a distinction of persons ("you" and "I") in the one reality of God who is love. The terms of *perichoresis*, *circumincessio* or "co-intimacy," coined by Tradition, translate that scriptural finding. … The *perichoresis* invites us to balance the univocity of trinitarian *taxis* ... with a dimension of reciprocity in equality. Now, the third person carries as its proper name ("Holy Spirit") two names ("Spirit" and "Holy") which are common to the other two persons and, as *condilectus*, concludes and maintains open the relationship among them. Therefore, the Spirit, *nexus amoris* ... best expresses the dimension of reciprocity in that stream of love that is God.[171]

5.4 *The Spirit of the Father and the Son*

In Bonaventure's theological explication of the *filioque*, the Spirit as *nexus*, the Son as *imago*, and the Son as *medium* all play a role. All of these aspects convey relationality. For Bonaventure, the teaching of the *filioque* is not unrelated to the way in which he contemplates the interrelationality—the implicate order—of divine life. The Son's co-spiration of the Spirit thus manifests the Spirit's unitive identity as *nexus* between Father and Son, the Son's imitative expression of the Father, and the Son's role as *medium* in the life of the Triune God.

The Father and the Son do not thereby form a fundamental piece of the trinitarian puzzle isolated by themselves as if a dyadic unit separable from the Spirit. Rather the Father and the Son culminate in the hypostatic mystery of

---

[171] Begasse de Dhaem, *Mysterium Christi. Cristologia e soteriologia trinitaria* (Assisi: Cittadella Editrice, 2021), 44-45.

mutual love, the "*extremum* in which they are conjoined,"[172] the *unitas caritatis*—the Holy Spirit.

The Spirit reveals that order is for love—that love completes order. In the Spirit, the circle of divine life is complete as it culminates in mutual love.

---

[172] *I Sent*., d. 11, au., q. 1, resp. (1:212a)—see n152 above.

The Spirit: *Ratio finiendi*

This is the third and final chapter of Part One of this study. Having explored in the previous two chapters Bonaventure's theology of the Father and the Son, the focus now shifts to the third person of the Trinity: the Holy Spirit. As such, this chapter is the target of the theological investigation developed in the above preparatory chapters, and thereby comprises one of the key chapters of this study as a whole.

In the third person, the "eternal cycle"—the intelligible circle—of divine love culminates.[1] Fontal fullness does not result in more emanations: rather, in the embrace of mutual love, the loving Father and the beloved Son realize in perfect concord their *unitas caritatis*—the mystery of *condilectus*, perfection of divine life. The *ordo perfectus* is complete in the complete manifestation and eternal realization of pure act, which is pure goodness: love. Order is about love.

Accordingly, Bonaventure makes such references to the Spirit as *terminatio*,[2] *ultimus*,[3] *extremum*,[4] *ultima et completiva ratio*,[5] *ratio tertii*,[6]

---

[1] The term "eternal cyle" comes from Pseudo-Dionysius, whom Bonaventure quotes: "Whence, 'divine love is a certain eternal cycle (*cyclus*), from the good (*ex optimo*), through the good (*per optimum*) and into the good (*in optimum*).' From this it is gathered (*colligitur*), that he speaks of the conjunction (*coniunctionem*) of the beginning with the end (*principii cum fine*)." *I Sent.*, d. 45, a. 2, q. 1, resp. (1:804b-805a). The image of "eternal cycle" functions similarly as the image of the "intelligible circle," which Bonaventure also uses to describe divine life (see n90 in Chapter One above). For Bonaventure, the circle is the most perfect shape because the end returns to the beginning (see *III Sent.*, d. 1, a. 2, q. 1, resp. [3:20b]; Hellmann, *Divine and Created Order*, 16-17; Ratzinger, *The Theology of History in St. Bonaventure*, trans. Zachary Hayes [Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1989], 143-145).

[2] *I Sent.*, d. 2, au., q. 3, fund. 2 (1:55a).

[3] *I Sent.*, d. 2, au., q. 3, fund. 3 (1:55a); *Myst. Trin.*, q. 4, a. 2, fund. 2 (5:84b); *Hex.*, 11.7 (5:381a).

[4] *I Sent.*, d. 11, au., q. 1, resp. (1:212a).

[5] *I Sent.*, d. 11, au., q. 2, ad 2 (1:216a).

[6] *I Sent.*, d. 12, au., q. 4, ad 1 (1:226a); *I Sent.*, d. 11, au., q. 1, ad 3 (1:213a).

ratio complectentis,[7] *ratio ultimi sive quietativi*,[8] *amor complectens*,[9] *ratio finiendi* and *finalitas*,[10] *causa finalis*,[11] *ratio terminantis complementi*,[12] *finale complementum*.[13] Such references[14] convey that the very zenith of infinite goodness, which originates forth from the sourceless *fons* that is the Father, is the Spirit. As zenith, the Holy Spirit is the point of return, as it were, the person in whom divine life returns to the Father. The end returns to the beginning.[15] Fehlner puts it as follows: "Because the Holy Spirit is the *nexus* of love between the Father and Son in so far as they are one and not distinct, and because this mutual sharing is once and for all infinite, there is no fourth person, and the love of the Trinity is consummated in the procession of the Holy Spirit."[16] Hayes writes similarly: "It is with the spiration of the Holy Spirit that the trinitarian circle of divine life is completed."[17]

To explicate Bonaventure's theology of the Holy Spirit—especially in terms of the Spirit's finality—constitutes the goal of this chapter. The key question that this chapter asks is: What is the significance of the Holy Spirit as the completion of the Holy Trinity?

In order to answer this question and develop a theology of the Spirit's finality, I divide this chapter into four sections. The first section is propaedeutic in nature. It consists first of an opening, prefatory reflection on the finality of the Spirit in the Trinity. Then, it offers a brief investigation of the *Summa Halensis*' theology of the transcendentals and the finality of their

---

[7] *1 Sent.*, d. 12, au., q. 4, ad 1 (1:226a).

[8] *1 Sent.*, d. 26, dub. 4 (1:632b).

[9] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 5, a. 2, ad 9 (5:96b).

[10] *Brev.*, 1.6.4 (5:215b).

[11] *Dec. prae.*, 3.2 (5:516a).

[12] *Hex.*, 1.12 (5:331b)

[13] *Hex.*, 21.4 (5:432a).

[14] Note that not all of these references function in the exact same way. Sometimes the reference is more implicit than explicit; some are used as appropriations and others as proper to the Spirit.

[15] Thus, the idea is not that the Spirit is like the third and final expression of the divine essence; the life of the Trinity is not a linear line that has an endpoint. See *I Sent.*, d. 2, au., q. 2, ad 4 (1:54b): "To that which is objected, that in the first there is *status*; it should be said that just as in [a plurality of] essences, one is the first essence, from which and to which the others [are] (*a qua sunt aliae et ad quam*), so also in [the plurality of divine] persons there is a person, from whom and to whom the others are (*a qua sunt aliae et ad quam*); and in that [person] is the *status* of origin, because that [person] is from no one, and this is the person of the Father."

[16] Fehlner, *The Role of Charity*, 107.

[17] Hayes, "Introduction," 62.

order, which is related to pneumatic finality within the Trinity. This first section concludes, then, with some preliminary remarks about the Spirit as the *completio Trinitatis* in Bonaventure.

The second section is the most substantial section of this chapter. It enters into Bonaventure's theology of the Holy Spirit in the inner life of the Holy Trinity as articulated principally in his *Commentarius in Primum Librum Sententiarum*. In this text, Bonaventure expounds systematically his pneumatology. This section thus offers a relatively detailed and attentive reading of key distinctions therein. We will see how Bonaventure defines his terms, makes critical distinctions, and develops a profound theology of the Holy Spirit.

The third section then develops further Bonaventure's theological vision of the Spirit. It reflects on Bonaventure's pneumatology—specifically in terms of the (comm)union of the Father and Son—and considers how it nuances what it means to think about essential unity in a trinitarian way.

The final section comprises a concluding synthesis.

1. Propaedeutic Remarks: Pneumatic Finality

1.1 *The Spirit Terminates: A Prefatory Explanation*

In an insightful passage from the *Collationes in Hexaemeron*, Bonaventure speaks of the Father as "originating principle," the Son as the "exemplary center," and the Spirit as "terminating completion."[18] He then avers that these three persons are "equal and equally noble, because it is of equal nobility for the Holy Spirit to terminate (*terminare*) the divine persons, just as it is for the Father to originate (*originare*) [the divine persons], or for the Son to represent them all (*omnia representare*)."[19] Accordingly, just as origin and exemplarity refer to the position, so to speak, of the Father and the

---

[18] *Hex*., 1.12 (5:331b).
[19] *Hex*., 1.12 (5:331b). Admittedly, "them all" is a fairly liberal, if not incorrect, translation of *omnia*. I base my translation on the context of the passage; therein, it makes most sense that *omnia* should refer to the divine persons. In his translation, Jay Hammond also translates *omnia* as "them all." The Delorme text could potentially lend itself to an alternative reading, inasmuch as the context there includes reference to creation; see *Hex*., princ., 1.12 (ed. Delorme, 5-6).

Son in the ordered life of the Holy Trinity *ad intra*, so termination designates the position of the Spirit.

Furthermore, Bonaventure uses *terminare* in this passage to elucidate the way in which the Holy Trinity is *propter se*. Earlier in the same paragraph, that is, Bonaventure affirmed that *esse* is said in two ways: either 1) *ex se*, *secundum se*, and *propter se*, or 2) *ex alio*, *secundum aliud*, and *propter aliud*.[20] The former is descriptive of uncreated being, and the latter of created being. Unlike created being, then, the uncreated Trinity is from itself, according to itself, and for the sake of itself. The first feature (*ex se*) refers to the innascibility of the Father; the second feature (*secundum se*) refers to the centrality of the Son; and the third feature (*propter se*) refers to the finality of the Spirit.

To say that the Holy Trinity is for the sake of itself (*propter se*) is to say that the Spirit completes the Trinity—completes the personal unfolding of divine life. Uncreated being is thereby for the sake of love: the Father and Son's wholly gratuitous spiration of the Spirit completes trinitarian order. Love is its own end, and so the ultimate reason lies in the very gratuity of love itself—hence is the Spirit called "Gift."[21]

The metaphysics of the Trinity—undetermined by any extrinsic principle—emerges, then, as follows:

- *ex se*, which conveys an unoriginated source (*principium* = the Father);
- *secundum se*, which conveys a center (*medium* = the Son); and
- *propter se*, which conveys an end or term (*finis, terminus* = the Spirit).

The Father is the *principium totius divinitatis*; the Son is the *exemplar totius divinitatis*; and the Spirit is the *terminus* or *completio totius divinitatis*. To

---

[20] As such, Bonaventure interprets the metaphysical mystery of being itself in light of the Trinity: the structure of being—in both its uncreated and created mode—is trinitarian. The revelation of God as triune impacts metaphysics. It is not the case, then, that some non-Christian metaphysical system is imposed on the Trinity, but rather that the Trinity is illuminative of the structure of being itself.

[21] See, e.g., *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 2, fund. 2 (1:197a); *I Sent.*, d. 18, au., q. 1, fund. 4 (1:323a). See also Section 2 below where I discuss in greater detail the pneumatology of love and gift.

quote Hayes once more: "the Spirit is the inner-divine hypostasis in which the divine life comes to fullness and completion."[22]

Admittedly, it is not so easy to understand precisely what that means. The Father as source and the Son as exemplar have a more straightforward content. But the Spirit as *terminus* seems abstract. What does that mean? While it is a key concern of this chapter as a whole to elucidate and put forth a theology of pneumatic finality, at this point, I suggest but two elements that help provide a preliminary picture. First, the foundational context to interpret the Spirit as *terminatio* of divine life lies in Bonaventure's theology of *ordo*. To refer to a by now oft-cited passage: "Ubi est perfectus ordo, ibi est ratio principii, medii et ultimi."[23] Second, because order in the Trinity speaks to the order of origins and thus to the persons themselves, it is ultimately *who* the Spirit is that will illuminate the significance of pneumatic finality.

To see how these two elements come together and shed light on the Spirit's finality, I here consider, albeit briefly, Bonaventure's discussion of the appropriations in the *Breviloquium*. Therein, he emphasizes that the appropriations convey order. For instance, the first set of appropriations treated is unity, truth, and goodness.[24] Bonaventure states that the true ($\rightarrow$ the Son) presupposes the one ($\rightarrow$ the Father), but the good ($\rightarrow$ the Holy Spirit) presupposes both the one and the true. A certain intelligible order emerges between the one, the true, and the good.

Consequently, the appropriations, which "lead to an understanding and knowledge of what is proper,"[25] thereby manifest a kind of trajectory within the divine life of the three divine persons. This trajectory begins in the Father, "origin of the persons," and, together with the Son "who is from the Father," it culminates in the Spirit "who is from both as love and gift."[26] Goodness is thus the end because, as Aristotle taught, "the good and the end are the same."[27] Specifically, the Spirit as love and gift—in other words the Spirit's

---

[22] Hayes, "The Doctrine of the Spirit," 182.
[23] *Hex.*, 11.7 (5:381a).
[24] *Brev.*, 1.6.2 (5:215a).
[25] *Brev.*, 1.6.1 (5:215a). Regarding Bonaventure's theology of appropriations, see my comments in the Introduction of this study.
[26] *Brev.*, 1.6.2 (5:215a).
[27] *Brev.*, 1.6.4 (5:215b).

distinctive identity—is the termination of the inherent ordered trajectory constitutive of divine life.

A certain pneumatic thrust enfolded within the very personal identities of the Father and the Son comes to light. Indeed, the personal identities of the Father and the Son remain incomplete without the Spirit. Pneumatic finality is thus, above all, about the person of the Spirit within the ordered perichoretic life-movement of the divine essence that *is* the trinity of persons. One can speak of pneumatic finality in Bonaventure because the stress is on the persons and not the essence. The infinite divine essence is the Trinity of persons, who, in their perfect order, reveal a *terminatio*: the *perfectio* of Love.

There is obviously a lot to unpack here. This brief prolegomenon anticipates a more thorough analysis and explication, which this chapter will develop. The critical point to grasp here is that the divine life of the Holy Trinity culminates in the Spirit: the Spirit terminates the other divine persons, each of whom in turn fundamentally presupposes and anticipates the Spirit. Thus, the Father and the Son, in their gratuitous spiration of the Spirit, reveal the completion of the order of the Trinity as an order of love perfected in charity—*unitas caritatis*. The infinite life of the three-personed God *is* an origin, a center, and a final point of consummation and completion.

1.2 *The Summa Halensis and "Pneumatic Finality"*

I now take a step away from Bonaventure and turn to the *Summa Halensis*, in which—as Taylor Boyd Coolman has shown—a rich "pneumatic finality" emerges.[28] The synthesis achieved by the *Summa Halensis* sheds light on Bonaventure's own theology of the Spirit's finality.

To begin, I should clarify that my choice to consider the one, the true, and the good above was intentional. These three "transcendentals"—what Bonaventure calls *conditiones entis*—come out of developments in philosophy and theology in the early thirteenth century. In addition to the important contributions of William of Auxerre and Philip the Chancellor, of

---

[28] See his "Pneumatic Finality of Goodness in the *Summa Halensis*," in *Saint Bonaventure: Friar, Teacher, Minister, Bishop*, ed. Timothy Johnson et al. (St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 2021), 83-98. In this subsection, I rely heavily on Coolman's text.

particular importance in the development of a theory of the transcendentals is the *Summa Halensis*.[29] A brief investigation into the theory of the transcendentals in the *Summa Halensis*—which, as will become evident, cannot but include a word about pneumatic finality—will illuminate Bonaventure's own theological project. Among other things, it is significant that the transcendentals, at least in the *Summa Halensis* and in Bonaventure's thought-world, are not unrelated to trinitarian theology and metaphysics.[30]

As developed in the *Summa Halensis*, the transcendental notions—the one, the true, and the good—do not differ "extentionally," but rather "intentionally."[31] That is, they "coincide in in the same thing (*in idem*)," but their "intentions differ" because they refer to formally different features of being.[32] Importantly, such intentionality ultimately betrays a certain ordered progression of the transcendentals. Therefore, while they each refer to different formal features of being, there is an intrinsic order or relationship between the one, the true, and the good. In brief, the transcendental notions of *unum*, *veritas*, and *bonum* correlate with *ens*, *esse*, and *bene esse* respectively. *Veritas* adds, so to speak, something to *unum*; and *bonum* adds something to *veritas*. An ordered progression emerges and this progression finds in the "good" its "completion or perfection."[33]

---

[29] See Coolman, "Pneumatic Finality," 85. For the classic study on the transcendentals in medieval thought, see Jan Aertsen, *Medieval Philosophy as Transcendental Thought: From Philip the Chancellor (ca. 1225) to Francisco Suárez* (Boston – Leiden: Brill, 2012). Aertsen discusses the *Summa Halensis* at 135-147, and calls it "one of the most extensive medieval accounts [of the doctrine of the transcendentals], which deserves more attention that it has received so far" (135). *Nota bene*: While I am using the term "transcendentals" in my discussion here, it is neither in the *Summa Halensis* nor in Bonaventure, who uses the term *conditiones entis*. According to Aertsen: "It was not until Duns Scotus and the Scotist 'school' of the fourteenth century that the expression became common" (29).

[30] Regarding Bonaventure's appropriations of unity, truth, and goodness to the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, Aertsen comments: "Bonaventure's interest shows the continuity of the Franciscan tradition, for the 'trinitarian' motive was the salient feature of the doctrine of the transcendentals in the *Summa Halensis*." *Medieval Philosophy*, 149-150.

[31] I am taking these words from Coolman's article.

[32] "Although in reality the true, the one, and the good coincide in the same thing, nonetheless their intentions (*intentiones*) differ …. For the 'one' adds indivision (*indivisionem*) to existence (*ens*): whence, unity is the indivision of existence (*entis*); but the 'true' adds to the indivision of existence (*entis*) the indivision of being (*esse*): whence the truth is the indivision of being and what is of it (*eius quod est*); but the 'good' adds to the indivision of existence (*entis*) and being (*esse*) the indivision according to good-being (*secundum bene esse*): whence the good is called the indivision of act from potency, and act is called the completion or perfection (*complementum sive perfectio*) of possibility for which a thing is born (*ad quam res nata est*)." *SH* I, n. 88, resp. (1:140a). See also *SH* I, n. 73 (1:113-116); Coolman, "Pneumatic Finality," 87.

[33] See n32 above; *SH* I, n. 88, resp. (1:140a); *SH* I, n. 74 (1:116b).

To describe what the good "adds" to the one and the true, the Halensist writes: "Whence the good is called the indivision (*indiviso*) of act from potency, and act is called the completion (*complementum*) or the perfection of possibility, for which a thing is born (*ad quam res nata est*)."[34] Coolman offers a helpful interpretation of this difficult passage:

> Mere *esse* corresponds to an entity's nature and the potencies entailed therein, while *bene esse* is the real, actualized existence [of] said nature. *Ens*, *esse*, and *bene esse*, accordingly, might be well-rendered, respectively, as "simple being," "being in potency," and "being in act" …. These distinctions are formal, rather than actual …. They are not added to a thing in a causal event distinct from the causal event that produces the thing. These are intentionally, not extensionally, distinct and they are simultaneously, not sequentially present in any being. It could be said that since being is one, it is an *ens*; since it is true, it also is/has *esse*; since it is good, it also is/has *bene esse*.[35]

Coolman identifies this order of the transcendentals as the "triadic transcendental structure of being."[36] The thematic articulation of this structure, achieved by the *Summa Halensis*, constitutes a major advance in the theory of the transcendentals. In Avicenna, for instance, Aertsen points out that his philosophy of the primary notions lacks any "account of the inner relations and order between" them.[37] In Philip the Chancellor, while an order between *unum*, *verum*, and *bonum* begins to emerge, it remains, according to Coolman, "underdeveloped."[38] For the Halensist, however, unity, truth, and goodness manifest order. The order does not connote a chronological sequence, but rather metaphysical structure.[39] This structure "'terminates' in

---

[34] See n32 above (also quoted also in Coolman, "Pneumatic Finality," 87). See also *SH* I, n. 73, ad 2 (1:116a): "Indivision falls in the reason of 'the one' and of 'the true' and of 'the good': but indivision in the reason (*ratione*) of 'the one' is the indivision of existence (*entis*); whence 'the one' is undivided existence (*ens indivisum*); in the reason of 'the true' is the indivision of being (*esse*), because the truth is the indivision of being and what it is (*eius quod est*); in the reason of 'the good' is the indivision of completeness (*complementi*) from potency (*a potentia*), which is meant to be completed (*quae est nata compleri*), when it attains (*attingit*) its end: whence goodness is the indivision of act from potency, and act is called perfection or competion (*perfectio sive complementum*)."

[35] Coolman, "Pneumatic Finality," 88.

[36] Coolman, "Pneumatic Finality," 89.

[37] Aertsen, *Medieval Philosohpy*, 100; cf. Coolman, "Pneumatic Finality," 90.

[38] Coolman, "Pneumatic Finality," 90; cf. Aertsen, *Medieval Philosophy*, 121.

[39] "It is not sufficient to say simply that being is simultaneously one, true, and good. Rather, unity, truth, and goodness 'accumulate,' presuming what is logically prior and enabling what is logically posterior." Coolman, "Pneumatic Finality," 90.

goodness. The full realization or expression of being … only emerges at the end. … Unity and truth tend toward goodness and in a sense lend themselves to it and are consummated by it."[40] Indeed, "'the good' is that by which (*ex quo*) a thing is ordered (*ordinari*)."[41]

In the *Summa Halensis*, then, being's metaphysical structure betrays orientation to the good: the finality of being—the termination of its transcendental structure—is goodness. "In the *SH*, one must speak of the '*finality* of the good.'"[42] Especially significant for the purposes of the present study, however, is that this finality pertains not only to the structure of created being, but it also refers in some way to the structure of uncreated being. How so?

Foreshadowing Bonaventure, the *Summa Halensis* speaks of God as efficient, formal and final cause.[43] The three transcendentals correspond to this triple causality: unity speaks to God as efficient cause, truth to God as formal cause, and goodness to God as final cause. The Halensist then deepens the correspondence and makes it explicitly trinitarian: the reason of efficient causality is appropriated to the Father; the reason of formal causality is appropriated to the Son; and the reason of final causality is appropriated to the Holy Spirit.[44]

Once again, moreover, it is the finality of this structure that consummates what is prior to it. Coolman explains that "the Halensist [following Aristotle] affords final causality explanatory priority over the

---

[40] Coolman, "Pneumatic Finality," 90.

[41] *SH* I, n. 73, resp. (1:115a). Goodness speaks to the "indivision of the principles [of a thing] which constitute (*constituunt*) the thing in order toward its end (*in ordine ad suum finem*)." *SH* I, n. 73 (1:116a).

[42] Coolman, "Pneumatic Finality," 93. It would be too great a digression to develop this point at length here, but it is worth mentioning that—and this is especially the case for Bonaventure—this triadic structure, clearly trinitarian, corresponds to the very structure of salvation history, which culminates in the *plenitudo bonitatis* (*Brev.*, 7.1.2) of heavenly glory; see my remarks in Section 2.2 of Part Two, Chapter One.

[43] See, for example, *SH* I, n. 73 (1:115a).

[44] "The intention of the 'one (*unius*)' refers to the one speaking (*dicentem*), the intention of the 'truth' [refers] to the word, and the intention of 'goodness' [refers] to the good for what it is (*propter quod est*). The one speaking is the Father, to whom is appropriated the reason of efficient causality (*ratio efficientis*); the word [is] the Son, to whom [is appropriated] the reason of formal causality (*ratio formalis*); the good [is] the Holy Spirit, to whom is appropriated the reason of final causality (*ratio finalis*)." *SH* I, n. 88, resp. (1:140a). Coolman ("Pneumatic Finality," 93) concludes that creation is thus "transcendentally 'watermarked' by unity from the efficient cause, truth from the exemplary cause, goodness from the final cause."

others. … The final cause takes on the nature or the *ratio* of the other causes, thus assimilating them to itself."[45] To quote the *Summa Halensis* directly:

> Because the final cause is the cause of causes, as is clear in lesser things, because the end moves (*finis movet*) the efficient [cause], the movement of efficient causality (*efficiens motus*) seeks the matter for the work, as suits (*prout congruit*) the end [of the work]—just as for the sake (*ad finem*) of cutting, one seeks the iron from which the saw is made, and then imprints the form on the matter according to the intention of the end. Hence it is the case that the end puts on (*induit*) the reason (*rationem*) of the other causes, which principally are: of the efficient cause, insofar as it moves the agent (*movet agentum*); of the formal [cause], insofar as it is a rule (*regula*) for the agent so that he may complete (*perficiat*) his work; of the final [cause], insofar as the work is completed (*completur*). … Thus—since the end is good—the good itself, insofar as it moves, puts on (*induit*) the reason of the agent; insofar as it regulates, [it puts on] the reason of art or exemplarity; insofar as it completes, then is it in the proper reason (*ratione propria*) of the final cause.[46]

As this passage articulates, final causality "puts on" the other causes. Enfolded within final causality is both efficient causality, because the end is what moves the agent, and formal-exemplar causality, because the end regulates. Efficient and formal-exemplar causality look to, anticipate, and even find their ultimate reason in final causality.

As intimated already, this robust account of final causality enters into the metaphysical structure also of uncreated being. When dealing with the augustinian triad of appropriations—unity, equality, and concord—the Halensist explains that unity is appropriated to the Father because the Father "is not from another." He is the *principium aliorum*, and for this reason, unity is correctly appropriated to him. Equality is appropriated to the Son, because equality implies some sort of plurality. To explain why concord is appropriated to the Holy Spirit, the Halensist quotes Richard of St. Victor:

> For just as there is no equality without a plurality of existents (*consistentium*), therefore neither is the concord of the two (*concordia duorum*) posited without the Trinity of existents: in the Father is the origin (*origo*) of unity, in the Son the beginning (*inchoatio*) of plurality,

---

[45] Coolman, "Pneumatic Finality," 94.
[46] *SH* I, n. 104, resp. (1:163b). Quoted also in Coolman, "Pneumatic Finality," 94.

and in the Holy Spirit the completion of the Trinity (*completio Trinitatis*).[47]

Concord is appropriated to the Holy Spirit because it ultimately points to something proper to the Holy Spirit. The Spirit, as *concordia duorum*, is *completio Trinitatis*. In other words, the plurality of personal distinction emerges forth in the eternal generation of the Son by the Father. Plurality, however, is not the final word of the infinite life of God. The Father and the Son love one another and in their perfect harmony they breathe forth the Spirit, who completes the trinitarian dynamic of love.[48] Origin anticipates plurality, which in turn anticipates the harmony of final completion. The Holy Trinity manifests pneumatic finality.

1.3 *The Completion of the Perfect Trinity*

I return now to Bonaventure. In his *De mysterio Trinitatis*, he also uses the phrase *completio Trinitatis*:

> Again, however much something is prior, it is that much more powerful and actual. Therefore, the First Principle was necessarily most actual and most powerful; but the act of the First Principle, according to which it is principle, is to-be-principle (*principiare*); therefore if in the First Principle, for the very reason that it is first, it is necessarily posited the reason (*ratio*) of supreme actuality and power, then it is necessarily

---

[47] *SH* I, n. 449, resp. (1:643b-644a); See Coolman, "Pneumatic Finality," 96. For the passage in Richard's corpus, see *De tribus appropriatis*, in *Opuscules Théologiques*, ed. Jean Ribaillier (Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1967), 183-184. See also Richard, *De Trinitate*, 3.18 (ed. Ribaillier, 153): "the consummation of true and supreme goodness is not able to subsist without the completion of the Trinity," which completion lies in the mystery of the Spirit.

[48] Indeed, the Spirit as *condilectus* is, for Richard, precisely what brings the mystery of charity to its perfection. For Richard, that is, the *consummatio caritatis* requires that there be a trinity of persons (see *De Trinitate*, 3.11 [ed. Ribaillier, 146-147]). Richard writes: "Just as the perfection (*perfectio*) of one requires a *condignum*, so the perfection of both surely requires a *condilectum*" (*De Trinitate*, 5.8 [ed. Ribaillier, 205]). For a thorough reading of the pneumatology of Richard's *De Trinitate*, see Melone's *Lo Spirito Santo nel De Trinitate de Riccardo di S. Vittore*. Of many possible citations to choose from, see Melone, 245-246: "lo Spirito Santo … ha un carattere di *compimento*, in quanto rappresenta la perfezione della carità che è ontologicamente l'essenza di Dio. Naturalmente questo compimento non ha un valore né cronologico né tantomeno causativo: non è la condizione della perfezione di Dio. Il compimento va inteso piuttosto in senso dinamico: all'interno della carità perfetta che è Dio, la pienezza sovrabbondante di perfezione viene garantita e manifestata dalla *condilectio*."

granted the truth of eternal production, and through this the completion of the perfect Trinity (*completio trinitatis perfectae*).[49]

The *completio* of the Holy Trinity, for Bonaventure, lies in the mystery of "eternal production": the eternal generation of the Word and spiration of the Holy Spirit. While Bonaventure does not explicitly identify in this passage the Spirit, the term *completio* includes an implicit reference to the Spirit. Let me explain.

Admittedly, "eternal production" designates both the generation of the Son and the spiration of the Spirit. Nonetheless, when set within the context of Bonaventure's trinitarian theology as a whole, the accent falls on spiration. To recall a theme investigated in the previous chapter, the full reality of generation itself implies spiration. Generation of the Son—the *medium* coming forth from the *primum*—anticipates, implicates and is even incomplete without the *tertium*. Without spiration, the emanation of the Word is incomplete.[50] Where there lacks a termination, lacking also is the *medium*.[51] There is not an infinite number of persons in God because there is a *terminatio*: trinitarian infinity does not diminish order but rather manifests *completionem*.[52] Ultimately, it manifests completion because there is *status* in the third and final person.[53] Perfect order requires a single termination: the *ratio tertii* in whom distinction is ordered and "completive unity" realized.[54] The completion of the Holy Trinity is the completion of perfect order, the completion of which lies in the mystery of the third member. To borrow from Hellman:

> Number three is the first number to indicate unity and plurality. Number one stands alone. Number two introduces plurality (between one and three), but it is in number three that a middle is introduced and the two are brought into unity. … The number two introduces duality and this brings with it distinction. Distinction, however, … clamors for unity.

---

[49] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 8, a. 1, fund. 2 (5:113a).

[50] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 2, fund. 1 (1:197a).

[51] See *I Sent.*, d. 2, au., q. 3, fund. 2 (1:55a); *Myst. Trin.*, q. 4, a. 2, fund. 2 (5:84b).

[52] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 4, a. 2, resp. (5:86a). See also *Myst. Trin.*, q. 4, a. 2, ad 4 (5:86b) where Bonaventure argues that no more than two emanations bespeaks not any kind of a defect, but rather *complementum*.

[53] See Section 2.3 in Chapter One above.

[54] *I Sent.*, d. 11, au., q. 2, ad 2 (1:216a). See also *Hex.*, 8.12 (5:371a) and *I Sent.*, d. 11, au., q. 1, ad 3 (1:213a).

The number three allows for distinction, and at the same time, it resolves the extremes into unity.[55]

Furthermore, Bonaventure uses the term *complementum* to refer to the Holy Spirit.[56] As seen above, this term also appears in the *Summa Halensis*.[57] Therein, the discussion revolved around the finality of goodness: *complementum* was used to describe the indivision of act from potency. It connoted the complete perfection of being's intrinsic potentiality. The term functions similarly in Bonaventure's 21st collation of the *Hexaemeron*. In the first part of this collation, Bonaventure devotes his attention to the Holy Trinity and to the perichoretic interplay of appropriations, which look to the Trinity as *originans principium*, *gubernans medium*, and *finale complementum*. In his presentation, finality characterizes the appropriations of the Spirit. For instance, his analysis of power, wisdom, and will follows the basic structure of the transcendentals of the one, the true, and the good. Bonaventure explicates the intrinsic order between them, and ultimately concludes that "will reduces (*reducit*) the principle into act."[58] Accordingly, actuality falls on the third term of the order. Importantly, then, he says that these appropriations regard the persons themselves: they do not only speak to the Trinity in reference to creation, but to the inner life itself of the Holy Trinity.[59] The Spirit, as *complementum*, is the *completio Trinitatis*—the manifestation and realization of the fullness of the "purity of goodness, which is pure act."[60] There is *status* in the Holy Spirit.[61]

---

[55] Hellmann, *Divine and Created Order*, 11.
[56] See *Hex.*, 21.4 (5:432a); *Hex.*, 1.12 (5:331b).
[57] See n34 above.
[58] *Hex.*, 21.5 (5:432a). See also *Brev.*, 1.6.5 (5:215b).
[59] "According to which [the Holy Trinity] is the originating origin (*origo originans*), then these three are appropriated, namely power (*potentia*), wisdom (*sapientia*), and will (*voluntas*). These three are necessary to the originating principle. For wisdom is founded (*fundatur*) on some power. For if it did not have power, it would not be able to produce anything (*nihil posset producere*). If it had power, but did not have wisdom, it would not produce wisely, because power without wisdom is reckless (*praeceps*). Again, if it had power and wisdom, but did not will (*et nollet*), then it would either produce nothing, or it would be unwilling (*invitus*) and thus it would be wretched (*miser*). And thus it is clear that will reduces (*reducit*) the principle into act. And because in these is also the reason of eternal originating (*ratio principiationis aeternae*), therefore these three are appropriated to them, not only as the originating principle of others, but even with respect of the persons." *Hex.*, 21.5 (5:432a).
[60] *Itin.*, 6.2 (5:311a).
[61] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 2, ad 3 (1:198b). Again, see Section 2.3 in Chapter One above.

In addition, in his treatment on unity in the *De mysterio Trinitatis*, Bonaventure had affirmed that unity and Trinity are not repugnant to one another: there is rather a "marvelous concord (*concordiam*) and harmony."[62] *Concordia*, however, is the classical Augustinian appropriation for the Holy Spirit. The *Summa Halensis* quotes Richard of St. Victor's use of it, as well.[63] It would not be too bold a suggestion, then, to identify in Bonaventure's words "marvelous concord and harmony" an implicit reference to the Spirit. The primordial unity of the Father, which begets plurality, reaches ultimate termination in the Spirit, the "*concordia* of unity [→ the Father] and equality [→ the Son]."[64] Divine unity is trinitarian unity.

Significantly, moreover, in order to respond to the argument that if there is distinction in God, then it must be most perfect and thus contrary to supreme unity, Bonaventure responds that "distinction is said perfectly in two ways: either *intensive* or *completive*."[65] The former does not apply to the Trinity, but the latter does. Distinction is said *completive* because trinitarian plurality does not recede from the highest unity. Completive distinction: herein lies the finalizing mystery of the Spirit, in whom lies the union that follows after distinction, the *completio Trinitatis*.

2. Bonaventure's Treatment of the Holy Spirit in the *Commentarius in Primum Librum Sententiarum*

I turn now to Bonaventure's dogmatic treatment of the Holy Spirit in his *Commentarius in Primum Librum Sententiarum*. The objective is to explicate the key themes and lineaments of Bonaventure's theology of the Holy Spirit within the inner life of the Trinity. To do so, I follow the logic and flow of the text of select distinctions: d. 10 (the Spirit's procession and titles), d. 18 (pneumatology of gift), and d. 32 (the Spirit as love of the Father and Son).

---

[62] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 2, a. 2, resp. (5:65a).
[63] See n47 above.
[64] *Brev.*, 1.6.3 (5:215a). This is a quotation from Augustine's *De doctrina christiana*, 5.5.
[65] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 2, a. 2, ad 13 (5:67a).

2.1 *The Spirit: Procession and Titles (<u>I Sent.</u>, d. 10)*

Distinction 10 initiates Bonaventure's investigation of the procession of the Holy Spirit. It consists of two articles. The first article focuses specifically on the Spirit's procession, and the second article focuses on the personal properties of the Spirit.[66]

2.1.1 *I Sent*., d. 10, a. 1

Article one consists of three questions. In the first question, Bonaventure establishes that there is a divine person who proceeds *per modum liberalitatis*. The second and third question then deepen what is meant by such a procession. To proceed *per modum liberalitatis* (q. 1) is to proceed *per modum amoris sive caritatis* (q. 2) and ultimately *per modum mutuae caritatis* (q. 3). The sequence of the questions is not random, but logical and ordered in its progression.

2.1.1.1 *I Sent*., d. 10, a. 1, q. 1: *per modum liberalitatis*

In his response to the first question, Bonaventure states that there is a person who proceeds *per modum liberalitatis*, "who is called Gift."[67]

> And the reason for this is the perfection (*perfectio*) of love, the perfection of emanation, and the perfection of the will, which—existing in a most generous manner (*liberalissima*)—cannot but produce (*producere*) a person; just as the nature, existing in a most fecund manner (*fecundissima*), cannot but produce a person. And this is the proper reason (*ratio propria*) of this emanation.[68]

In this passage, Bonaventure makes explicit the parallelism between generation and spiration.[69] Generation manifests the perfect fecundity of nature and spiration manifests the perfect liberality of the will.[70]

---

[66] For a helpful synthesis of *I Sent*., d. 10, a. 1-2, see Melone, "*Spiritus sanctus facit nos similes illi summae Trinitate*," 125-134.

[67] *I Sent*., d. 10, a. 1, q. 1, resp. (1:195b); see also fund. 2 (1:195a).

[68] *I Sent*., d. 10, a. 1, q. 1, resp. (1:195b).

[69] See Melone, "Spiritus Sanctus," 761.

[70] See also *I Sent*., d. 10, a. 1, q. 1, fund. 3 (1:195a).

Liberalitas constitutes a key component of Bonaventure's pneumatology. Melone explains well the significance of this term, and shows the connection between liberality (q. 1) and love (q. 2):

> The meaning that [*liberalitas*] assumes is twofold: on the one hand, with this term he [Bonaventure] simply wants to indicate freedom and, therefore, the act of a free will that represents the most perfect act of the will itself. On the other hand, the term *liberality* indicates generosity in its most broad sense, which implies the gratuity and abundance in the gift. In light of this twofold sense, one can understand the successive movement in Bonaventure's arguments: the communication *per modum liberalitatis* is understood as a form of giving, intrinsically connected with love, in which one gives truly only when one loves; thus, the most perfect form (*prima et summa*) of proceeding according to liberality is that of proceeding according to love (*per modum amoris*).[71]

Melone sheds light on the intrinsic logic of Bonaventure's argumentation, especially between the first and second question of this distinction. In the end, an emanation through the mode of love (*per modum amoris*) ultimately surfaces as an emanation *per modum mutuae caritatis* (q. 3).

Before moving on to the second question of article one, I attend to each of Bonaventure's responses to the four opposing arguments.

The first contrary argument suggests that there cannot be such a procession in God, because creatures, which are created by an act of God's will, are extrinsic to God. Such a procession, linked to the will, would thus result in the emanation of a person that is not one in essence with God.[72]

To respond, Bonaventure makes a distinction. To emanate *per modum liberalitatis* can be said in two ways. In one way the emanation is willed (*sicut volitum*) or gifted (*donatum*). For example, a creature is willed as an object of the divine will. In another way, however, this mode of emanation pertains to the principle itself of willing (*ratio volendi*) or of giving (*ratio donandi*). This second way speaks to the procession of the Spirit.[73] Accordingly, the third person is gift as the very principle or reason for giving.[74] Such a *ratio* is

---

[71] Melone, "*Donum in quo omnia alia dona donantur*," 54-55 (emphasis in original)
[72] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 1, opp. 1 (1:195a).
[73] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 1, ad 1 (1:195b).
[74] Hayes, "Introduction," 58-59: "As in treating the emanation of the Son, Bonaventure distinguishes that which necessarily proceeds from God as the exemplar of all reality and is therefore the very *ratio exemplandi* from that which proceeds as *exemplatum*; so also here, he distinguishes between the emanation of the Spirit as the very *ratio volendi*

"intrinsic to the most perfect will."[75] In addition to preparing for his treatment of the Spirit as Gift in distinction 18, Bonaventure's theology here draws a close connection between the Spirit and the metaphysical status of creation as gift.[76] Created being is gifted (*donatum*) being.

The second contrary argument holds that the one existing through the mode of the will is neither assimilated in the substance of the one producing, nor equal to the one producing, nor produced necessarily. None of these would befit a divine person.[77]

To respond, Bonaventure again makes a distinction, thereby offering a fuller ontology of the will. The will can be a principle in two ways: either distinct in nature or concomitant with nature.[78] In the previous chapter, I described the concomitant relationship between the two emanations as an implicate order. In effect, the contrary argument fails to take this implicate order into account. Bonaventure's point is that procession *per modum voluntatis* or *liberalitatis* is concomitant with nature. The Holy Spirit is not of a different essence.

The third contrary argument holds that, in addition to nature and will, there should also be—as is the case among inferior realities—an emanation through the mode of art.[79]

To respond, Bonaventure asserts that every noble mode of production is reduced to the mode of nature or will: "because every agent acts either

---

from the *volitum*, or created reality as an actual object of the divine will. Viewing the two emanations together, we can conclude that the created world is known by God in the knowledge whereby he generates the Son, and is loved by him in the love by which he spirates the Spirit."

[75] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 1, ad 1 (1:195b).

[76] See also *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 1, fund. 4 (1:195a): "Again, all creatures proceed from God through knowledge and will; but before the production of creatures, it was fitting to place (*ponere fuit*) in God (*in divinis*) the emanation of the Word from eternity (*ab aeterno*), in which the Father disposed all things to be made (*fienda disposuit*). Therefore, by similar reasoning, it was necessary that a person emanate in whom he would will and bestow (*vellet et donaret*) all things. But such [emanation] proceeds (*procedit*) *per modum liberalitatis*."

[77] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 1, opp. 2 (1:195a).

[78] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 1, ad 2 (1:195b). The Quarrachi editors, in the *Scholion* (1:196a), explain that the will, insofar as it designates a "potentia contra naturam" (i.e., not concomitant with nature), is the principle of created reality; insofar as it is concomitant with nature and communicates the nature, then it is principle of spiration.

[79] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 1, opp. 3 (1:195a). Drawing from Aristotle, the argument makes the point that certain things exist insofar as they are the product of some art, e.g., a house exists thanks to art (*Metaphysics* XII.3).

naturally or through the will."[80] With respect to the specific point about art, Bonaventure stresses that a procession through the mode of art is always extrinsic to the agent. In this way creation proceeds as an artifact (*sicut artificiatum*).[81] The emanations of the divine persons, however, are intrinsic; they share in the same nature. Thus Bonaventure continues to emphasize that every mode of emanation in God is either through the mode of nature principally or concomitantly because the persons share in the same nature. He concludes:

> Hence, since the procession (*processus*) through the mode of the will is able to be intrinsic—just as love proceeds from the one loving (*procedit amor ab amante*)—but [a procession] through the mode of art is always extrinsic: therefore, it is impossible that such [a procession through the mode of art] take place in God with respect to the persons, but [it] does apply to God with respect to creatures.[82]

The final contrary argument posits that love is more perfect insofar as it is communicated to a greater plurality. So not only should there be posited a third, but also a fourth "and so on to infinity." Since that would not befit the divinity, the point of termination must lie "in the first person producing."[83]

To respond, Bonaventure denies the premise of the contrary argument. He shows that the perfection of love lies in three persons:

> If therefore mutual love is not able to be less than to one (*minus quam ad unum*), and the communication of that mutual [love] is not [able to be] less than to one (*non minus quam ad unum*), and in one is mutual love, and in the other the communication of mutual love perfectly, since each receives the whole infinitely; it is clear that it is not necessary to proceed further, but there is a terminating point (*ibi est stare*).[84]

Bonaventure here provides the framework of the perfection of mutual love. The *status* of mutual love lies ultimately in the Spirit. As such, the Spirit

---

[80] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 1, ad 3 (1:196a).

[81] Bonaventure distinguishes between the emanation of the Son as the *ratio artificiandi* and the act of creation which proceeds *sicut artificiatum*; see *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 1, ad 3 (1:196a). See also *Red. art.*, 12 (5:322b-323a) where Bonaventure identifies a certain correspondance between the creation of an artifact to the generation of the Son; in the mechanical arts one can glimpse the very mystery of the Word's generation.

[82] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q .1, ad 3 (5:196b).

[83] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 1, opp. 4 (1:195b).

[84] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 1, ad 4 (1:196b).

completes the fontal first's loving, diffusive goodness, and reveals that such fontality finds its ultimate termination in mutual love. The Holy Spirit *perfects* the dynamic of love in divine life.[85] While mutual love requires at bare minimum two, its perfection—à la Richard of St. Victor—requires that it be shared and communicated. Three is the number of the perfection of mutual love, much like three is the number of infinity.[86]

2.1.1.2 *I Sent*., d. 10, a. 1, q. 2: *per modum amoris sive caritatis*

Bonaventure now develops further what is meant by *per modum liberalitatis/voluntatis*. To proceed in this way is to proceed through the mode of love or charity: "Love is the gift in which all other gifts are given (*in quo omnia alia dona donantur*): for nothing is properly given if not through love (*nisi ex amore*). If, therefore, a person proceeds *per modum liberalitatis …* then it is through the mode of love or charity (*amoris sive caritatis*)."[87]

In his response, Bonaventure asserts that an emanation via the mode of the will must be "first and most noble (*prima et nobilissima*)." It is precisely an emanation via the mode of love that fits this description.[88] To substantiate this claim, Bonaventure takes a phenomenological approach. He turns, that is, to the human soul and remarks that the affection of love is the "first (*prima*) of all the affections and the root (*radix*) of all the rest."[89] It is also the most noble affection (*nobilissima*), because of its liberality. The emanation of the Spirit—precisely because it is via the mode of the will—is thus further unveiled as an emanation of love.

Bonaventure then responds to six opposing arguments. I need not go through all six. For the sake of space and on account of their content, I here focus on the second and third.

---

[85] See also *I Sent*., d. 10, a. 1, q. 1, fund. 1 (1:194b-195a): "More perfect (*perfectior*) is mutual love than reflected love (*reflexa*), and even more perfect (*perfectior*) is mutual love that is communicated rather than not communicated." Melone ("*Spiritus sanctus facit nos similes illi summae Trinitate*," 133) comments: "Ecco dunque il *perficitur* della *communio* che lo Spirito compie."

[86] See Section 2 in Chapter One above.

[87] *I Sent*., d. 10, a. 1, q. 2, fund. 2 (1:197a).

[88] *I Sent*., d. 10, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (1:197b).

[89] *I Sent*., d. 10, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (1:197b). See Robert Prentice, *The Psychology of Love According to St. Bonaventure* (St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 1992), 80-81.

The second opposing argument bears upon the important idea, which comes from Gregory the Great, that love is a certain stretching forth toward the other (*tendere in alium*). It thereby concludes that love is "always received as stretching forth in the other." The problem, however, is that "every [divine] person is in itself perfectly *ens* and distinct: therefore no person proceeds through the mode of love."[90] In other words, if a divine person tends toward and is received into another, then that person cannot be perfect *in se*. An emanation *per modum amoris* diminishes the hypostatic singularity of the third divine person.

To respond, Bonaventure needs a concept of procession that does not threaten hypostatic status, yet that can account for the deeply relational and inter-penetrative mystery of charity. He begins by distinguishing two ways in which something proceeds into another:

> To that which is objected, that the love of charity always stretches forth into another (*in alium tendit*), and thus proceeds into the other and does not stand firm in itself (*stat in se*); it should be said that to proceed into another is twofold: either because it regards the other as object (*ut obiectum*), or because it stretches forth in the other and is received (*in aliud tendit et recipitur*).[91]

This distinction provides Bonaventure with just what he needs. It gives him a framework to use Gregory's definition of charity within the Trinity's love-life *ad intra*. Specifically, Bonaventure applies the first sense of procession to trinitarian life. His reason: "because it is fitting to have a gaze (*respectum habere*) toward another person; whence, the Holy Spirit is the love, by which the Father loves the Son (*quo Pater amat Filium*)."[92] The Father gazes upon the Son—and the Son upon the Father—in the hypostatic love of the Spirit. The Spirit proceeds into another, e.g. into the Son from the Father, *ut obiectum*: that is, proceeds into the Son as the object of the Father's love.

Bonaventure thus couples his theology of procession with the identity of the Spirit as the love of the Father and Son. Put simply, to proceed into the other as object (*ut obiectum*) is to proceed as the love by which the one-loving

---

[90] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 2, opp. 2 (1:197a).
[91] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 2, ad 2 (1:198a).
[92] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 2, ad 2 (1:198a).

loves the object of love. In God, however, this love does not subsist in the will of the lover as in human love, but comes out hypostatically. Commenting on this same argument and distinction, the 17th century Capuchin bonaventurean, Bartholomaeus de Barberiis puts it concisely: "In God, the Holy Spirit is the love by which the Father loves the Son, and thus, by such love, a gaze (*respectus*) is conveyed to the person, as well as a hypostasis."[93]

What about the second sense of procession *in alium*? To depict the problem with the second sense of procession, Bonaventure analyzes the phenomenon of human love. "When I love another, love does not exit (*exit*) from me, in such a way that it is received (*ut recipiatur*) in another, but only insofar as it proceeds from the will."[94] My love for another remains in the will, in which it subsists.[95]

This feature, however, does not pertain to the mystery of the Spirit's procession as love: the Spirit subsists *in se* as he comes out (*exit*) hypostatically. "But in God, since [love] is a hypostasis, it therefore subsists *in se*."[96] Therefore, in the Spirit lies the perfect and infinite manifestation of love poured forth. The Spirit, love proceeding from the lover (*amor ab amante*),[97] is yet hypostatically other-than the one-loving.

In saying "other-than," I underscore that the Spirit subsists *in se*. Nonetheless, the subsisting of the Spirit is utterly unique to the Spirit—just as both the Father and Son subsist in a way unique to them.[98] The Spirit alone is love-proceeding: *amor tendens in alium*. As such, the Spirit—though subsisting *in se* as a hypostasis—is inseparable from and ultimately interwoven with the personal identities of the loving Father and beloved Son. Indeed, the Spirit is the *unio caritatis*: the perfection of distinction (*perfectio*

---

[93] Bartholomaeus de Barberiis, *Cursus theologicus ad mentem Seraphici Doctoris S. Bonaventurae*, disp. 12, q. 7, n. 387 (vol. 1 [Lyons: 1687], 206b).

[94] *I Sent*., d. 10, a. 1, q. 2, ad 2 (1:198a).

[95] It is worth reflecting on this observation, as it helps to explain the difficulty inherent in the expression of human love. Tension exists inherently in human love because, while I can try to find the most apt way to make manifest my love, it but subsists within me. Human demonstrations of affection cannot but fall short of disclosing the full gravity of one's love for another. Accordingly, when someone has discovered a way to communicate their love in an efficacious—albeit still only partial—way, it leaves an indelible imprint within the beloved. It provides a glimpse of what takes place infinitely in God.

[96] *I Sent*., d. 10, a. 1, q. 2, ad 2 (1:198a).

[97] See n82 above.

[98] This point is fundamental to the theology advanced by Vetö in his *The Breath of God*.

distinctionis) between the Father and Son lies in union, and the supreme union *inter distantes* is the union of charity.[99] The finality of the Spirit emerges: the distinction between the first and second person is perfected in the union of charity that is the Spirit—*amor tendens in alium*.[100]

I now turn to the third contrary argument. This argument posits that an emanation through the mode of love—which obtains because the Father loves the Son—would imply an infinite number of emanations, because the Son loves the Holy Spirit, and so forth. An infinite number of emanations, however, does not befit God. Thus an emanation through the mode of love should be denied.[101]

To respond, Bonaventure says that there is such an emanation in God, but not only because "it is the love by which they [the Father and Son] love one another, but also because in them the will is most fecund. … And it [this fecundity of the will] is not in the Holy Spirit."[102] This fecundity is in the Father and the Son, and not in the Spirit, because—as Bonaventure clarifies in d. 11—they are *Deus improcessibilis*; they are thus the *principium* of procession.[103] Ultimately, there is no need for a further emanation, because there is *status* in the first love (*status est in primo amore*). Any further procession would be superfluous. As *status*, the Spirit is the culminating completion of the whole framework of divine love: the complete manifestation of the most fecund will of the Father and the Son is the *unio caritatis*. *Status in primo amore*: the goal of love is reached.

---

[99] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 2, fund. 3 (1:197a).

[100] The theology developed here anticipates Bonaventure's theology of the Spirit as *nexus*.

[101] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 2, opp. 3 (1:197ab).

[102] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 2, ad 3 (1:198b).

[103] "The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, insofar as they are one in their fecundity of will. … The fecundity of will is in the Father and the Son because each is God who cannot proceed (*Deus improcessibilis*). … Since therefore the Father is prior (*prior*) to every emanation, namely procession and generation, because he is neither generated nor proceeds, hence, he is principle (*principium*) in each case. And because the Son is prior to the emanation of procession, but not of generation … then he is the principle of spirating, not of generating." *I Sent.*, d. 11, au., q. 2, resp. (1:215b). See also *I Sent.*, d. 29, a. 2, q. 1, resp. (1:513b).

2.1.1.3 Inquiry: What Does It Mean to Proceed Into the Other?

Bonaventure's theology of procession as a proceeding into the other *ut obiectum* deserves further attention. Before, then, moving on to *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 3 I here explain this important characteristic of procession.

To do so, I first turn to Bonaventure's treatment of the *filioque* (d. 11). Significantly, one of the opposing arguments revolves around the very idea of procession *in alium*. This opposing argument thus offers Bonaventure the opportunity to clarify his theology of procession *in alium*. In brief, the argument facing Bonaventure is that the *filioque* implies unacceptable conclusions. That is, insofar as procession bespeaks "movement from one into one (*motus ab uno in alium*)," then if the Spirit proceeds not only from the Father, but also from the Son, then the Spirit would need to proceed either *in* the Father—which would imply the Father receives something from the Son—or *in* a fourth person.[104] Neither is acceptable.

To respond, Bonaventure appeals to the twofold sense of *procedere in alium* introduced already in distinction 10, namely, to proceed into another is either:

a) to proceed into another *sicut obiectum*, or
b) to proceed into another and be received by it.[105]

The second sense of procession would imply that the Spirit subsists in the Son. According to the first sense, however, "the Holy Spirit is the love, by which (*quo*) the Son loves the Father, and vice versa."[106] Bonaventure is consistent regarding this conceptualization of procession: *procedere in alium sicut obiectum* means that the Spirit proceeds as the love by which the Father and Son love one another. The Son is the object of the Father's love and the Father the object of the Son's. As alluded to above, in this love the Father gazes on the Son who, in turn, gazes on the Father.[107]

---

[104] See *I Sent.*, d. 11, au., q. 1, opp. 1 (1:209a).
[105] See *I Sent.*, d. 11, au., q. 1, ad 1 (1:212b-213a).
[106] *I Sent.*, d. 11, au., q. 1, ad 1 (1:212b).
[107] See n92 above.

The Father and the Son thereby mutually stretch forth and incline (*tendere*) toward one another in the Spirit. To proceed into the other *sicut obiectum* means that the Spirit proceeds as the love of the Father for the Son and of the Son for the Father. Yet the Spirit subsists neither in the Father nor in the Son, but hypostatically *in se* as their *nexus*: the complete hypostatic manifestation of love-for-another (*in se*) realizes the fullness of communion (*nexus*). The Spirit is the person in whom distinction is completed in communion. The Spirit, as *nexus*, is the *extremum* "in which they [Father and Son] are joined together (*coniunguntur*)."[108]

In a subsequent distinction (d. 13), Bonaventure treats specifically the mystery of procession in God and continues to tie it to the Spirit as *nexus*:

> For the complete account (*rationem*) of procession, these two [features] are required: that it stretches forth from someone and into someone (*ab alio et in alium tendat*). But love, which is the Holy Spirit, proceeds neither from the Father insofar as he loves himself, nor from the Son insofar as he loves himself, but rather insofar as one loves the other,[109] because [the Spirit] is *nexus*: therefore the Spirit is the love, by which the one-loving stretches forth into the other (*quo amans tendit in alium*): therefore [the Spirit] is the love both from one and into one (*ab alio et in alium*).[110]

Procession involves both a stretching forth from (*ab alio*) and into (*in alium*). And, as stated above, the Spirit proceeds *in alium sicut obiectum*, that is, as the object of love of the divine person from whom the Spirit proceeds. The one-loving (*amans*), and thus the one from whom the Spirit proceeds, is the Father, but it is also the Son.[111] They *both* stretch forth toward one another in the notional act of spirating the Spirit, who is thereby their *nexus*. "The one-loving stretches forth through love into the one-loved."[112] Bonaventure's theology of procession both corroborates the theology of the *filioque* and constitutes a theology of binding love.

---

108 *I Sent.*, d. 11, au., q. 1, resp. (1:212a).
109 This is a reference to the notional love of the Father and the Son that spirates the Spirit. See Section 2.1.2.1 below.
110 *I Sent.*, d. 13, au., q. 1, fund. 4 (1:231a).
111 Hence there are two *spiratores*—see *I Sent.*, d. 29, a. 2, q. 1-2 (1:512-516).
112 *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 3, ad 1 (1:199b)—see n140 below.

For Bonaventure, then, procession *ab alio et in alium* thereby involves a *principium a quo* and a *terminus ad quem*.[113] The Spirit proceeds forth from (→ *principium a quo*) and toward (→ *terminus ad quem*). The Spirit is love-proceeding toward its term, namely, *ad amatum*. In Bonaventure's words: "In God, both aspects (*uterque respectus*) [i.e., a *principium a quo* and a *terminus ad quem*] are found; for the person proceeding has reference (*respectum habet*) to the principle from which, and love proceeding (*amor procedens*) has reference to the beloved (*ad amatum*)." Bonaventure specifies that this love proceeding "is *nexus* and charity: therefore, truly and properly and perfectly is the reason of procession found in God."[114] The divine person who is Love is love that proceeds from and to—*ab alio et in alium*.

The Spirit's procession comes to light then as a certain movement *ab alio in alium*. Indeed, the term *procedere* itself conveys a certain forward movement. This movement, however, as an intrinsic divine emanation is not locomotion. Bonaventure finds more fitting the language of causality:

> For a causal procession in one way is terminated in the one proceeding, and in such a way that it regards nothing further, as when it is said: a son proceeds from a father. In another way, [procession is terminated] as an effect regards (*respicit*) someone (*aliquem*) as term (*ut terminum*): and in this way love proceeds from the one-loving into the one-loved (*amor ab amante in amatum*). And in some way it agrees (*convenit*) with local procession, because it regards a *terminum ad quem*, but in another way it differs, because it does not regard the termination as if it is received in it, but as the object (*obiectum*).[115]

As this passage conveys, the Son does not have a *terminus ad quem* in the same way as the Spirit, who proceeds as love from one into one.[116] The *terminus ad quem* of the Spirit is the object of love of the Father, namely the

---

[113] "The complete account (*ratio*) of procession consists in a relation (*in comparatione*) to the principle from which (*principio a quo*) and to the termination to which (*terminum ad quem*); and because the Spirit—in its emanation, because it is *nexus*—regards both, [but] the Son regards only one [→ *principium a quo*]; therefore the most complete reason of this name [i.e., procession] is found in the Holy Spirit, although in some way it is found in the Son; and thus it is appropriated to the Holy Spirit." *I Sent.*, d. 13, au., q. 2, ad 4 (1:234b).

[114] *I Sent.*, d. 13, au., q. 1, resp. (1:231b).

[115] *I Sent.*, d. 13, au., q. 1, ad 4 (1:232ab).

[116] See *I Sent.*, d. 14, a. 1, q. 1, resp. (1:245b), where Bonaventure grants that *processio*, insofar as it refers merely to an emanation "ab hoc, scilicet a Patre," can cover both the emanation of the Son and the Spirit. But insofar as procession means *ab uno in alium*, it refers only to the emanation of the third person.

Son, *and* the object of love of the Son, namely the Father. And to stretch forth in this manner is to proceed "as mutual love." Therefore, the Spirit "proceeds from two, and thus from one into one (*ab uno in alium*)."[117] The procession from the Father and the Son is a procession from one into the other and vice versa.

Before concluding this subsection, one of Bonaventure's remarks from his later *De decem praeceptis* deserves attention. There, he says that the Son *est Deus de Deo*.[118] This creedal description of the Son refers particularly to the Son's generation. The Spirit, however, is not *Deus de Deo*. Bonaventure utilizes a different formulation: *est Deus et in Deo*. The Spirit is not *de Deo* like the Son, but *in Deo*—i.e., *in Deo sicut obiectum*. The preposition *in* signals the fundamental framework of procession: *ab alio in alium*. "Deo," accordingly, supposits here differently than "Deus," and stands for the divine persons who are the object (*in alium*) of the Spirit's procession. The Spirit is God in God: God the Father stretching forth *in Spiritu* toward the Son and God the Son stretching forth *in Spiritu* toward the Father.[119]

By way of conclusion, I should like to make three points. First, Bonaventure's theology of procession offers a coherent way to contemplate the circularity of divine life. The circularity of divine life, in Bonaventure, is related to his theology of order. That is, perfect order (*ordo perfectus*) requires an ultimate return to the first term of that order.[120] And this return unfolds *ad modum circuli intelligibilis*.[121] It unfolds in this manner because in the circle—the most perfect shape—the end returns to the beginning.[122]

---

[117] *I Sent.*, d. 14, a. 1, q. 1, resp. (1:245b). Bonaventure had just distinguished between the two senses of *procedere*.

[118] *Dec. prae.*, 3.11 (5:517a). Cf. Augustine, *De Trinitate*, VI.2.3, XV.17.31.

[119] See *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 2, fund. 3 (1:202a). Vetö's (*Breath of God*, 80-81) description of the Spirit's subsistence bears similarity to Bonaventure's own intuition: "while the first and second hypostases subsist in a way 'outside' of each other, or better yet, 'in front of each other' and 'face-to-face,' the eternal Breath subsists inside the other two."

[120] *Brev.*, 2.1.2 (5:219a). Obviously in God, this first term is the Father. It should be clarified, though, that the Father—totally *a se*—does not receive something from the Son or the Spirit; this would jeopardize the Father as *principium totius divinitatis*. The Spirit's procession is *in alium sicut obiectum*; the Spirit does not proceed into the other so as to be received by it. Nonetheless, the Spirit's procession is from two persons, and "from one into one" (see n117 above): from the Father into the Son and from the Son into the Father. Hence the Spirit's procession has a *terminus ad quem*. Ultimately, while this *terminus ad quem* is both the Father and the Son, the accent falls on the Father from whom and to whom are the second and third person (see n15 above).

[121] *Brev.*, 2.4.3 (5:221b).

[122] See n1 above.

Therefore, "for the sake of the most perfect completion (*ad perfectionem completissimam*), it is necessary that all the [divine] persons are brought back (*reduci*) to the one, who is the principle of the others."[123] This *reductio* to the Father is completed in the procession of the Spirit: the Son returns to the Father in the love—the Spirit—by which he gazes or breathes into the Father as the object of his love. Accordingly, the Spirit returns to the Father *per Filium*.[124] The circle of divine life is closed in the mystery of the third divine person, in whom the circle is complete: the end returns to the beginning. Divine order, and thus the whole *exitus-reditus* dynamic of divine life—the circular coming forth from and return to the *primum*, i.e. the Father—finds in the very procession of the Holy Spirit a certain intelligible articulation.

Bonaventure's pneumatology illuminates the neoplatonic dynamic of the circle by setting it within a theology of divine love: the mystery of the return to the Father within the intelligible circle of divine life hinges on a pneumatological metaphysic of love. Indeed, the ecstatic manifestation of hypostatic love "accompanies" or "carries" the whole eternal cycle of divine love: the Father generates the Son, yet not without the concomitant breath of love into the Son as object of his love, and this breath is—simultaneously and eternally—"returned" to the Father as object of the Son's love.

Relevant here is a passage from the 11th collation of the *Hexaemeron*. Bonaventure goes through four ways in which understanding (*intelligentia*), elevated by faith, says that God is three and one: namely, on behalf of perfection, of the perfection of production, the perfection of productive diffusion, and the perfection of diffusive love.[125] Here, I draw attention specifically to the final consideration: diffusive love. The Seraphic Doctor individuates three types of love: reflexive (*reflexa*), connective (*connexiva*), and charitable love (*caritativa*). Connective love is greater than reflexive

---

[123] *I Sent.*, d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 2, ad 3 (1:471b). See also *Myst. Trin.*, q. 2, a. 2, ad 17 (5:67b): "According to the fact that there [in God] an emanation of divine persons from the first as from a principle is granted, then it follows that a *reductio* to that [first] as to a principle, from whom they are produced, is not repugnant." Hence divine life "is like a certain intelligible circle (*quasi quendam intelligibilem circulum*)" (*Myst. Trin.*, q. 3, a. 1, resp. [5:70b]).

[124] See *I Sent.*, d. 31, p. 2, dub. 7 (1:552a).

[125] *Hex.*, 11.5-12 (5:381a-382a); see Klaus Hemmerle, *Theologie als Nachfolge: Bonaventura – ein Weg für heute* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder KG, 1975), 152-162.

love, but charitable love—"which has a beloved and a co-beloved (*condilectus*)"—is greater than connective love. He concludes:

> By this love, therefore, the Father loves the Son, and there is infinite heat. Again, there love is gratuitous [→ Father], owed [→ Spirit], and mixed [→ Son]. Again, there love is pure, full, and perfect, as flowing (*effluens*) and having flowed (*effluxa*) in the Son, as flowing back (*refluxa*) in the Holy Spirit.[126]

Pure love, flowing forth (*effluens*) from the Father, is fully expressed (*effluxa*) in the Son, and made perfect as it flows back (*refluxa*) in the Spirit. Herein lies the intelligible circle of divine love. The love that originates in the Father flows into and out of the Son and returns in the Holy Spirit. Luis (Luigi) Iammarone offers the following, insightful interpretation:

> The love existing between the divine persons is pure, divested of interest, full, perfect, flowing and fluid (*fluente y fluido*) in the Son, that is, as a current and, in turn, received in the Son and as flowed back (returning (*re-tornando*)) in the Holy Spirit to its source. In the Holy Spirit, the Trinity's life of love finds its fulfillment (*cumplimiento*). … The divine life, for Bonaventure, is the ebb and flow (*flujo y reflujo*) of the love between the divine persons.[127]

Second, the pneumatology developed here also corrects any approach to *ordo* that would view it as a kind of sequence.[128] The Spirit is not the epilogue that follows after the Father's generation of the Son. To view order in a sequential sense would mean that the Son is, in effect, begotten first outside of the union of charity, and thus that the Father's love for the Son would not be fully realized *in se* hypostatically and concomitantly with the Son's generation. This is simply not Bonaventure's position. Bonaventure's theology of procession entails the Spirit as *nexus* of the Father and the Son. Far from a mere hypostatic add-on, to be *nexus* is to be utterly involved in the life of the Father and the Son. Indeed, while the Son is the *medium* of the

---

[126] *Hex*., 11.12 (5:382a).

[127] Iammarone, "La Trinidad," in *Manual de Teología Franciscana*, ed. José Antonio Merino et al., 57-148 at 82.

[128] On this point, see *I Sent*., d. 29, a. 1, q. 1, resp. and ad 1 (1:509ab); there is no priority or posteriority in God inasmuch as it would designate some sort of imperfection. Bonaventure makes this point multiple times in his *De mysterio Trinitatis*; see, e.g., *Myst. Trin.*, q. 5, a. 2, ad 1 (5:95a), q. 8, ad. 1.2 (5:114b).

order of the Trinity, the Spirit is *inter* the Father and Son as *nexus*.[129] The Spirit is not sequentially third, but third in the order of origin, which places him in the very midst of, *inter*, the Father and Son. And the Spirit, as *nexus*, is the *extremum* "in which they are joined together."[130] To be *nexus*—and thus *inter*—spells out precisely what is meant to be *ratio tertii*, *ratio terminantis complementi* or *ratio finiendi*. Pneumatic finality is *inter*-relational.

Third, in a recent study, Nicholas Lombardo observes that while theologians have long pondered *from where* within the Trinity the Spirit proceeds, "the question of where the Holy Spirit proceeds *to* within the immanent Trinity has never been asked with the same clarity, forcefulness or interest."[131] Lombardo argues, then, that procession involves a *terminus a quo* and a *terminus ad quem*. This framework is present almost verbatim in Bonaventure who posits a *principium a quo* and a *terminus ad quem*. Similar to—though not necessarily in the same way as—Bonaventure, Lombardo argues for a return of the Spirit to the Father as the *terminus ad quem*.[132] Consequently, for Lombardo, "the Spirit's procession is a *necessary* accompaniment to the Son's generation, because it is intrinsic to the Son's identity to receive the Spirit from the Father and breathe the Spirit back to him."[133] This position coheres well with the theology of procession explored above and with the implicate order of emanations developed in the previous chapter. Admittedly, Bonaventure will not detail his theology of procession in the same way that a contemporary systematician like Lombardo does. Nonetheless, Bonaventure's rich theology of procession, coupled with his concomitant view of the emanations (implicate order), would provide contemporary systematics with a helpful source.

---

[129] See *In Luc.*, 3.55 (7:84b); *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 2, fund. 3 (1:197a).

[130] See n108 above. To be both *inter* and *extremum* renders impossible any kind of a sequential reading of trinitarian order.

[131] Lombardo, "Where Does the Holy Spirit Proceed To?," *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 23 (2022): 473-501 at 473.

[132] Lombardo also suggests that this framework of procession helps to resolve the apparent problem of trinitarian inversion; see his "Where Does the Holy Spirit Proceed To?," 495. Lombardo spells out the challenges of affirming the Spirit's return to the Father, as well as his own solution, in his "The Return of the Holy Spirit to the Father: A Puzzle for Trinitarian Theology," *Louvain Studies* 44 (2021): 114-130.

[133] Lombardo, "Where Does the Holy Spirit Proceed To?," 496.

2.1.1.4 *I Sent*., d. 10, a. 1, q. 3: *per modum mutuae caritatis*

The final question of d. 10, a. 1 reveals that to proceed *per modum amoris* is ultimately to proceed through the mode of mutual charity. As Bonaventure puts it succinctly in his response:

> Since love has the perfection of delight (*perfectionem delectationis*), and of union, and of rectitude on account of mutuality (*ex mutualitate*), then it is either not to be posited that a divine person proceeds through the mode of love (*per modum amoris*), or, if a person does proceed in that way, then it is through the mode of mutual love (*per modum mutuae caritatis*).[134]

The perfection of love lies ultimately in its mutuality. Again, herein the Holy Spirit as perfective emerges.[135] A procession through the mode of love, if it is to be perfect, is thus a procession through the mode of mutual love.

In the background here lies the trinitarian theology of Richard of St. Victor. For the Victorine, the perfection or consummation of charity lies in the mystery of mutual love and thereby in the very identity of the Holy Spirit who is the *condilectus*.[136] As the *condilectus*, the Spirit reveals and realizes the perfection of charity, and so completes the plurification intrinsic to the perfection of the divine being.[137] In effect, Bonaventure reveals that the perfection of procession *per modum voluntatis* is a procession *per modum mutuae caritatis*. Articulated as such, the procession of the Spirit betrays the Spirit's personality as love, as the very *unitas caritatis*[138] of the loving Father and beloved Son.

Bonaventure responds to four arguments. I here consider only the first, which has to do with the concept of love as a stretching forth into another. The objection argues that if there is mutual love, then it is the love of the Father in the Son and the love of the Son in the Father. If that is the case, then the Father receives something from the Son, which "is absurd."[139]

---

[134] *I Sent*., d. 10, a. 1, q. 3, resp. (1:199b).
[135] See n85 above.
[136] See for example, Richard of St. Victor, *De Trinitate*, 3.19 (ed. Ribaillier, 153-154).
[137] See also *Hex*., 11.12 (5:382a).
[138] *Myst. Trin*., q. 2, a. 2, fund. 9 (5:65a); see Section 3.1 below.
[139] *I Sent*., d. 10, a. 1, q. 3, opp. 1 (1:199a).

To respond, Bonaventure underscores that "the one-loving stretches forth through love into the one-loved (*amans per amorem tendit in amatum*), [but] he gives nothing to him."[140] In light of the preceding subsection, this response should not come as a surprise. With respect to the Spirit's procession, to stretch forth into another (*tendere in alium*) is to stretch forth into another *ut obiectum*.

2.1.2 *I Sent*., d. 10, a. 2

The second article of d. 10 also contains three questions.[141] In the first question, Bonaventure identifies love as proper to the person of the Spirit. As love, the Spirit is thereby *nexus* (q. 2). The third question discusses how "spirit" is said properly of the Holy Spirit.

2.1.2.1 *I Sent*., d. 10, a. 2, q. 1: The Holy Spirit as Love

Throughout this study as a whole, and especially in this chapter, I have often referred to the Holy Spirit as the love of the Father and Son, as well as the love by which the Father and Son love one another. It is not, however, altogether easy to decode exactly what such claims mean. After all, is not the essence of the Trinity love? If love is proper to the Spirit, then does that imply the Father and the Son are not love? What does it mean to say that the Father loves the Son by the love that is the Holy Spirit?

Bonaventure treats explicitly the manner in which the Father and the Son love one another by the Holy Spirit in distinction 32, which I discuss below.[142] Distinction 10, a. 2, however, constitutes a key prolegomenon to that discussion. In the first question of article 2, which asks if love is proper to the Holy Spirit, Bonaventure spells out the grammar of love in trinitarian theology: love in God can be taken essentially, notionally, or personally.

---

[140] *I Sent*., d. 10, a. 1, q. 3, ad 1 (1:199b). Otherwise, the Father would not be utterly *a se*.

[141] For a helpful analysis of *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, see Walter Principe, "St. Bonaventure's Theology of the Holy Spirit With Reference to The Expression 'Pater et Filius diligunt se Spiritu sancto," in *S. Bonaventura 1274-1974*, vol. 4, 243-269 at 254-258.

[142] See Section 2.3 below of this chapter.

Taken essentially, love refers to the divine essence: the love common to the three persons. The Holy Trinity is love essentially "because each person loves themselves (*quilibet diliget se*)."[143] This love refers to the *complacentia voluntatis*, and thus to each person's loving acceptance of the goodness of divine being. Love is said notionally, "because the Father and the Son harmonize (*concordant*) in spirating the Holy Spirit. This concord is *amor* or *dilectio*."[144] Taken personally, love refers to the Holy Spirit who is produced through the mode of perfect liberality. Bonaventure summarily states: "Hence, said essentially [love] bespeaks delight (*complacentiam*); whereas [said] notionally [it bespeaks] harmony (*concordiam*) in spirating; and [said] personally [it bespeaks] the process (*processum*) in that harmony."[145]

To render clearer the way these distinctions work, Bonaventure offers an example.[146] He considers the love by which two spouses love one another. A husband and wife love each other by a "social love" so as to live together. This love correlates with the essential love of God. The spouses also love each other in a conjugal manner for the sake of procreating. Loving in this way correlates with the notional love of the Father and Son. Then Bonaventure considers the offspring, but if produced only on behalf of the spouses' concord of will. In other words, he considers the offspring as, to echo Hayes' interpretation, a "spiritual emanation" brought forth by "mutual love."[147] This offspring Bonaventure calls *amor*, which correlates with the love that is the Holy Spirit. In the case of human love, the actual offspring is not called *amor* but *amatus*. "In God, however, it is truly and properly love (*amor*), having the nature (*ratio*) of love and of a hypostasis."[148] The Spirit—*amor* of the concord of the Father and Son—has the *ratio* of love because he proceeds through the mode of perfect liberality; the Spirit has the *ratio* of a hypostasis because it is distinguished from the Father and Son yet not essentially.

This example anticipates Bonaventure's explication of the Spirit as the love by which the Father and Son love one another insofar as the Spirit

---

[143] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 1, resp. (1:201a). See the following subsection (2.1.2.2), which discusses in more detail Bonaventure's theology of love as essential.
[144] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 1, resp. (1:201a).
[145] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 1, resp. (1:201a).
[146] See *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 1, resp. (1:201a).
[147] Hayes, "Introduction," 56.
[148] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 1, resp. (1:201a).

surfaces as the manifestation or as a quasi-effect, as it were, of the lovers' perfect concord.[149] In addition, Bonaventure's treatment inevitably continues to illuminate the meaning of the Spirit's finality. Just as the love of two spouses culminates in their offspring, the fruit of their love, so does the Spirit constitute the culmination of the perfect harmony of the Father and the Son.

Before moving on to the next question, I consider Bonaventure's response to one of the contrary arguments. A typical objection held that *amor*, rather than being proper to the Spirit, should be an appropriation, just as *sapientia* is an appropriation of the Son.[150] The force of the argument is strong given that love, like wisdom, is common to all three divine persons as a divine attribute. While the distinction between love as essential, notional, and personal is clearly an important piece to the puzzle, Bonaventure here needs to account for *why* such a distinction does not apply to an attribute like wisdom.

To respond, then, Bonaventure accentuates the relationality entailed by the term *amor*—a feature that *sapientia* does not intrinsically have. "Love bespeaks a relation (*respectum*) to those, who are joined (*nectuntur*) by love."[151] Consequently, love bears a similarity not to *sapientia* but to *verbum*—a proper name of the Son—"because it connotes a relation (*respectum*) to the one speaking. … And just as the Son proceeds from the Father through the mode of the word (*per modum verbi*), so does the Holy Spirit through the mode of love (*per modum amoris*)."[152]

2.1.2.2 Inquiry: What is Bonaventure's Theology of Essential Love?

As mentioned in the foregoing subsection, Bonaventure avers that love is said essentially of God *quia quilibet diligit se*. These words alone, however, would seem to imply that essential love simply designates each person's love for oneself. Theologically, this perspective seems awkward, if not

---

[149] See Section 2.3.2 below of this chapter.

[150] *I Sent*., d. 10, a. 2, q. 1, opp. 3 (1:200b).

[151] *I Sent*., d. 10, a. 2, q. 1, ad 3 (1:201b). Cf. Melone, "*Donum in quo omnia alia dona donantur*," 58.

[152] *I Sent*., d. 10, a. 2, q. 1, ad 3 (1:201b).

problematic. Is the essential love in God selfish? Does the Father "by himself" *only* love himself? What does Bonaventure mean by essential love?[153]

Admittedly, the phrase—*quia quilibet diligit se*—is potentially misleading in that it does not straightforwardly express the entirety of Bonaventure's position. This phrase, however, is complemented by Bonaventure's identification of essential love as *complacentia* at the end of his response in *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 1. Ultimately, as will be made clear, this word stifles the possibility to construe essential love as "self-love" in an unqualified sense. *Complacentia* implies a heterologic character to love predicated essentially of God. Indeed, Bonaventure's example of spousal love, in which the "social love" of the spouses corresponds to God's essential love, also suggests as much. Essential love includes a "social" dimension.

The question to ask, then, is: what is meant by *complacentia*? "Someone loves another," asserts Bonaventure elsewhere, "with the love of complacency (*amore complacentiae*) when he accepts his acts (*facta*) and approves of him (*ipsum approbat*) and delights in his goodness (*in bonitate eius complacet sibi*)."[154] *Amor complacentiae* is thus fundamentally social— an "alterocentric love."[155] The essential love of God, common to the three persons, speaks to their utter acceptance and approval of one another, their delighting in the infinite goodness of each other. Herein lies the heterologic mystery of essential love.

Such verbs as *to accept* (*accepere*) and *to approve* (*approbare*), moreover, recall Bonaventure's theology of the divine will—the *voluntas*

---

[153] The secondary literature on this topic is somewhat varied and has not sufficiently explicated the meaning of essential love. Stohr (*Trinitätslehre*, 149) says simply: "Das Wort Liebe kommt für Gott in einem dreifachen Sinn in Betracht, im wesentlichen, notionalen und persönlichen. Im ersten, weil jede Person sich selber liebt." Freyer (Freyer, "Der Hl. Geist," 48) puts it in a more nuanced way: "In der innergöttlichen Ordnung der Liebe unterscheidet Bonaventura drei verschiedene Arten der Liebe: die essentielle Liebe, mit der jede der drei göttlichen Personen aus sich selber liebt …." Hyacinth Ennis ("The Place of Love in the Theological System of St. Bonaventure in General," in *S. Bonaventura 1274-1974*, vol. 4, 129-145 at 130) formulates it simply as: "God is essentially love, love is the very substance of God." Hayes ("Introduction," 55) writes: "Essential love designates that love which is found in all three persons by reason of their nature as God, by which they love themselves; it is divine love in the absolute sense." Elizabeth Dreyer ("'Affectus' in St. Bonaventure's Theology," *Franciscan Studies* 42 [1982]: 5-20 at 7) identifies essential love as that "by which each of the persons in the Trinity loves by himself."

[154] *III Sent.*, d. 29, dub. 4 (3:653b). See also *I Sent.*, d. 17, p. 1, au., q. 2, resp. (1:297a); d. 17, p. 1, dub. 1 (1:304a). Cf. Prentice, *The Psychology of Love*, 132-134.

[155] Prentice, *The Psychology of Love*, 97.

complacentiae. In fact, Bonaventure himself had already made this explicit in his treatment of love said essentially, notionally, and personally. Therein he identified essential love specifically as the *complacentia voluntatis* "by which each person loves and is loved."[156] With this reference to the *complacentia voluntatis*, the heterologic character of essential love emerges explicitly. This heterologic character is built into the very fabric of the divine will.

Thus in his treatment of the divine will in the *De mysterio Trinitatis*, Bonaventure states: "I say *voluntas acceptans* on behalf of the highest charity in the one producing and the highest goodness in the product, which both necessary include in themselves the *voluntas complacentiae*."[157] This will is utterly accepting of every good. "The accepting will," writes Goff, "has for its object primarily the infinite goodness of the divine being, and, secondarily, all other potential goods that can be realized by the divine power, *ad extra*."[158] Accordingly, the *voluntas complacentiae* reaches beyond the confines of the individual person. It is utterly accepting of the essential divine goodness, which entails the personal plurality of divine life.[159] The Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit accept one another and delight in one another's infinite goodness.

In his erudite study of Bonaventure's trinitarian theology, Klaus Obenauer also makes this important connection between *amor essentialis* and the divine will:

> According to d. 10, a. 2, q. 1, ad 4, the *amor essentialis* is the "complacentia voluntatis," "qua quilibet amat et ametur." This will aims itself … as the *voluntas approbans* at everything good, "whether it be necessary or contingent, created or uncreated, from another or not from another, as is clear."[160] This means, among other things, that the essential *voluntas* embraces everything in God, so that its bearer, as

---

[156] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 1, ad 4 (1:201b).

[157] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 7, a. 2, resp. (5:111a). See also *I Sent.*, d. 6, au., q. 2 (1:127-128). See section 2.2.2 in Chapter Two above, where I discussed in more detail Bonaventure's treatment of the divine will.

[158] Goff, *Caritas in Primo*, 270. See also *Ibid.*, 280: "Bonaventure's conception of the will as accepting posits that the fundamental act of freedom is not with respect to choosing between this or that particular finite good or an act that terminates in producing or effecting a desired entity or state of affairs *outside* of the being acting (*effectus*). Rather, it is the *spontaneous* power of the divine will to *accept* and *love* that goodness objectively present in the *same* divine being (*affectus*)."

[159] See especially *Itin.*, 6.2 (5:311a).

[160] This quotation is from: *I Sent.*, d. 6, q. 2, resp. (1:127b-128a).

bearer of the *voluntas essentialis* can by no means only love himself, but rather must love all in God, including himself of course.[161]

The following question now emerges: What is the relationship between self-love (*diligit se*) and love of the other in God? In other words, what is the structural affinity between, for example, the Father's love for himself and his love for another? The theology behind the *complacentia voluntatis* helps to provide an answer, in that the essential love of God embraces everything that is good. The Father, then, accepts himself and the others. It still remains vague, however, the precise relationship between self-love and love for the other.[162] How does self-love include or entail love for the other?

To answer this question, I begin with a passage from Bonaventure's *Commentarius in Evangelium S. Lucae*—referred to already in Chapter Two above. In his commentary on Jesus' Baptism, and specifically on the Father's locution "This is my beloved Son," Bonaventure remarks:

> And for a greater expression, it is added: "in you it has pleased me (*in te complacuit mihi*)," that is, everything [in you] pleases me (*omne scilicet, quod palcet*); and this on behalf of (*propter*) the most perfect *nexum* of love, which is between the Father and the Son. Proverbs 3 [verse 12]: "as a father in the son pleases himself (*in filio complacet sibi*)."[163]

The citation from Proverbs is revelatory: the father *in the son* pleases *himself*. Accordingly, the Father's love for himself is not altogether separable from his love for the Son. Bonaventure thereby goes on to say that Christ is the "Word most similar and expressive of the Father *and therefore most pleasing*."[164] Maximally similar to the Father, the Word constitutes a kind of

---

[161] Obenauer, *Summa Actualitas*, 231. Obenauer takes his reflection further, and draws attention to Bonaventure's theology of charity in general (see *III Sent.*, d. 29, q. 3, ad 4 [3:645a]), concluding: "In Gott richtet sich die caritas weder primär auf die eigene noch primär auf die andere Person, sondern auf beide in einem. Jede Person kann die andere nur lieben, wenn sie das 'Beziehungsnetz,' in dem diese steht und welches für diese konstitutiv ist, mitliebt, was die Liebe zur eigenen Person einschließt. M.a.W.: Nur dann wird die andere Person in Gott geliebt, wenn diese Liebe dasjenige zum Gegenstand hat, was das eine essentiale Wohlgefallen in Gott selbst zum Gegenstand hat: nämlich alles in Gott" (232).

[162] In regards to this, I found extremely helpful Obenauer's *Summa Actualitas*, 205-240. In what follows, I draw heavily from Obenauer's study.

[163] *In Luc.*, 3.55 (7:84b).

[164] *In Luc.*, 3.56 (7:84b), emphasis mine.

co-center of gravity of the Father's own self-love.[165] The Father, in loving himself, cannot but also love the Word who is most similar to him.

Significant, moreover, is Bonaventure's comment regarding the slightly different formulation of the Father's locution in Matthew's Gospel: *in quo mihi complacui*. "Matthew alludes to the *complacentiam* of the Father with respect to the Word, insofar as he speaks himself in him (*dicit se in se*); and therefore he says: '*In quo mihi complacui*.'"[166] Commenting on this passage, Obenauer writes: "The Father finds himself anew in his Word expressed for himself and is pleased in this his Word. *The love for the other appears as self-love*: the lover pleases himself in the other, in whom he sees himself again in the complete identity of nature ('Verbum simillimum')."[167]

These comments reveal, then, not only the intrinsic heterologic character of self-love, but that self-love ultimately manifests itself in an ecstatic way.[168] In virtue of the essential love of God, the persons are *not* locked in their own personality. Indeed, self-love is itself realized in and manifested through love for the other. In the end, how can it not? How can the Father, in loving himself, not love his *primitas* and thus his fontal fecundity to generate the Son and spirate the Spirit? For Bonaventure, in the final analysis, "to originate and to be and to refer to another" are the same for the divine persons.[169] Hence, for a divine person to love oneself (*diligit se*) cannot but mean loving another, as well.

This perspective ties in with the theology of *circumincessio*: each person is "totally" in the others, and so to love oneself is to love the other.[170] Bonaventure's theology of essential love is thereby pregnant with the intrinsic plurality of trinitarian life. The Father—in loving himself—is carried beyond himself: the depth of his hypostasis "touches," as it were, the others, and reveals their inseparability. And ultimately, this movement beyond finds its

---

[165] See also *Myst. Trin.*, q. 1, a. 2, ad 8 (5:57b).

[166] *In Luc.*, 3.56 (7:84b).

[167] Obenauer, *Summa Actualitas*, 210 (emphasis mine).

[168] "Die eigene Person gewinnt sich dieser Sichtweise nach in ihrer Liebe nur in der anderen Person: ihr liebender Selbstbezug ist ekstatisch vermittelt." Obenauer, *Summa Actualitas*, 234.

[169] *I Sent.*, d. 26, au., q. 3, resp. (1:458a).

[170] See *Hex.* 21.19 (5:434b).

complete realization in the hypostatic love—the Holy Spirit—who is an *egressus* of love proceeding *ab alio in alium*.

To draw this subsection to close, I refer to one more passage that evinces this correlation between self-love and love for the other. As mentioned previously in this study, in the 21st collation of the *Hexaemeron*, Bonaventure presents a perichoretic theology of the appropriations. Without getting into the thickets of this complicated, yet rich, text, I draw attention to the following set of appropriations: *pius*, *verus*, *sanctus*. Bonaventure asserts:

> And according to these three, God is the pious worshipper (*pius cultor*) of himself, the true professor (*verus professor*) of himself, and the holy lover (*sanctus amator*) of himself; and each person relates to himself (*habet se ad se*) and to the other (*ad alteram*) in a pious, true, and holy manner (*pie, vere, sancte*): so that the Father is pious toward himself, pious toward the Son, pious toward the Holy Spirit, and true and holy, and so on with the others.[171]

God, who is essentially pious, true, and holy, is these things *as* Trinity. Thus, if God is a holy lover of himself, then it is the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit who are holy lovers: *ad se* and *ad alteram*. In effect, the Seraphic Doctor here fastens into a synthesis love of oneself (*ad se*) with love for the other (*ad alteram*).

This passage, however, is also interesting because, given the context and structure of *Hex.* 21, *sanctus* is ultimately an appropriation of the Holy Spirit. Obenauer thus avers that each person is a *sanctus amator* "in the Holy Spirit," in such a way that the mystery of self-love is mediated by the Spirit.[172] This interpretation illuminates and corroborates the passage from the *Commentarius in Evangelium S. Lucae* above: "'in you it has pleased me (*in te complacuit mihi*),'… and *this on behalf of* the most perfect *nexum* of love [=the Holy Spirit], which is between the Father and the Son."[173]

---

[171] *Hex.*, 21.7 (5:432b).

[172] "Vielleicht hat sich hier bei Bonaventura die Einsicht durchgesetzt, daß in Gott die Selbstliebe (und das Selbstverhältnis der Person überhaupt) dem Verhältnis zur anderen Person gleichzuordnen ist. In der Konsequenz eines solchen Ansatzes läge es, den Heiligen Geist als Liebe zur eigenen und zu allen anderen Personen hervorgehend zu betrachten. Dem Kontext von Hex XXI,7 nach wäre es ohnehin naheliegend, jede Person sich (zu sich und zu den anderen Personen) als sanctus amator *im Heiligen Geist* verhaltend zu verstehen, womit also die Selbstliebe durch den Geist vermittelt wäre." Obenauer, *Summa Actualitas*, 234.

[173] *In Luc.*, 3.55 (7:84b), emphasis mine—see n163 above.

2.1.2.3 *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 2: The Holy Spirit as *Nexus*

This question asks whether the Spirit is the "*nexus* or unity" of the Father and the Son. The theology of *nexus* is crucial to Bonaventure's pneumatology. It has already surfaced multiple times throughout this study.

The Spirit is the *nexus*, namely the unity, of the Father and Son. As he puts it in his concise response:

> The reason for this is that the Father and the Son communicate in one Spirit (*in uno Spiritu*), and therefore [the Spirit] is the unity of both (*amborum unitas*). Furthermore, that Spirit is love, and therefore they communicate in him as in one love. And since love is most properly a *nexus*, it follows that the Holy Spirit is properly a *nexus*, because he is mutual love, he is a unique and substantified (*substantificus*) love.[174]

Bonaventure had already identified in the previous question that love is proper to the Holy Spirit. Here, then, he explicates in greater detail what that means. Love is a "unitive power."[175] To be love is to be *nexus*.

The ontology of *nexus* emerges more clearly in Bonaventure's responses to the four contrary arguments. Given the importance of this term, I attend to all four.

The first contrary argument claims that there is need of a *nexus* only among things separated from one another. But the Father and the Son are not separated from one another, since the Father is in the Son and vice versa (*Filius in Patre et Pater in Filio*).[176] This contrary argument utilizes the language of *circumincessio* as an attempt to block the possibility of separation, and thereby to negate the role of a *nexus*.

To respond, Bonventure distinguishes between three senses of separation. The first sense is local or spatial separation. The second sense is separation according to essential difference. Neither of these apply to the kind of separation in God. The third kind, however, is not properly called separation but rather "distinction," which obtains on account of personal difference. This last sense describes the so-called separation in God: there is

---

[174] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 2, resp. (1:202b).

[175] See, e.g., *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 2, fund. 2 (1:202a); *I Sent.*, d. 10, dub. 1 and dub. 4 (1:205a and 206b); Prentice, *The Psychology of Love*, 73-74.

[176] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 2, opp. 1 (1:202a).

distinction between the first and second divine persons, and this distinction calls for a *nexus*.[177]

The second contrary argument concludes that no person in the Trinity is a *nexus*, because a *nexus* is that in which two persons come together (*conveniunt*).[178] But the Father and the Son do not come together (*conveniunt*) in a person, and so no person is their *nexus*.

To respond, Bonaventure incorporates the theology of the *filioque*. He avers that while the Father and the Son do not come together *formaliter* in a person, they do come together *originaliter*, "because one person is born from each in one and the same mode."[179] There is *convenientia originis*. To be origin of the Spirit is to come together in the Spirit. This response highlights the uniqueness of the Spirit's origin, as well as the significance of that origin in terms of the relationship between the Father and the Son. To give-origin to the Spirit realizes their unity-in-distinction *in* the Spirit.

The third contrary argument attempts to show that rather than the Spirit, it is the Father who is *nexus*. A *nexus* constitutes the bond between two subjects who come together (*convenire*) in a third "in whom they are united."[180] This third, however, is not the Spirit, but the Father in whom the Son and the Spirit come together *originaliter*. As primordial origin and source of divine life, the Father is *nexus*.

To respond, Bonaventure distinguishes between two senses of *convenientia*, explains the meaning of *nexus*, and thus shows its role within trinitarian life:

> To that which is objected, that the Son and the Holy Spirit come together in the Father; it should be said, that a coming-together (*convenientia*) of origin is said in two ways: either because they are born from one (*oriuntur ab uno*), or because from them one is born (*ab eis oritur unus*). If because "from one," then it is not called *nexus*, because a *nexus* is the union consequent to distinction (*unio consequens distinctionem*), but the unity in origin comes before the distinction. If, then, because there is an origin of one, it follows that—since there is distinction and consequential union (*sit distinctio et consequens*

---

[177] See *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 2, ad 1 (1:202b).
[178] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 2, opp. 2 (1:202a).
[179] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 2, ad 2 (1:203a).
[180] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 2, opp. 3 (1:202a).

unio)—there is most properly a *nexus* there; and so it is in the Father and the Son with respect to the Holy Spirit.[181]

This passage reveals that the dynamic unfolding of divine life "begins" in the unity of origin that is the Father. The Father's generation of the Son "gives rise" to distinction. This distinction is not, however, "final." Coming forth from the Father and the Son is the Spirit: the *unio consequens distinctionem*. Bonaventure's theology of *nexus*, in effect, corresponds to Richard of St. Victor's formulation of the Spirit as *completio Trinitatis* quoted above.[182]

This theological structure of *nexus* continues to play a role in Bonaventure's treatment of the *filioque* (d. 11). As discussed previously, the Spirit as "*nexus* or communion" of the Father and the Son is the "end (*extremum*) in which they are joined together (*coniunguntur*)."[183] Thus, *nexus* does not have the nature of a center (*ratio medii*) but rather of the third (*ratio tertii*).[184] Nexus "begins (*incipit*) from distinction and stretches forth (*tendit*) or leads (*perducit*) into unity: hence the ultimate and completive principle (*ratio*) is unity."[185] Precisely as *nexus*, then, the finality of the Spirit emerges in a pronounced manner. The *nexus* is the *ratio tertii*, and the ultimate meaning of this is unity: the Spirit is the culmination of divine life because the whole emanative process of goodness finds its ultimate resolution in the unity of the Father and the Son in the love of the Spirit.

I turn now to the fourth and final contrary argument. It argues that a *nexus* either is bound (*nectitur*) or binds (*nectit*). The Spirit, if *nexus*, must therefore either be bound or bind. The first option will not work, because then another person would be the binding *nexus*; but the second option is also problematic, because then the Spirit would give something to the Father and the Son.[186]

---

[181] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 2, ad 3 (1:203a).
[182] See n47 above.
[183] See n108 above.
[184] *I Sent.*, d. 11, au., q. 1, ad 3 (1:213a).
[185] *I Sent.*, d. 11, au., q. 2, ad 2 (1:216a). The antecedent distinction, however, does not imply that the Father and the Son are two different principles of the Spirit: they are one in the "fecundity of will" (*I Sent.*, d. 11, au., q. 2, resp. [1:215b]). The Spirit proceeds forth from them "insofar as they are one" (*I Sent.*, d. 11, au., q. 2, ad 2 [1:216a]). That said, there are two subjects who spirate, and thus two *spiratores*.
[186] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 2, opp. (1:202b).

Bonaventure's response plays an important role in his later discussion on the Spirit as the love by which the Father and the Son love one another. His main point here is that certain verbs have a passive signification even in an active voice—e.g., "I see" and "I hear." *Nectere*, when said of the Holy Spirit, is another example. The Spirit does not, strictly speaking, "give" something to the Father and the Son. Commenting on this argument, Principe asserts:

> Therefore, the Holy Spirit is bond of the Father and Son in that he proceeds in a passive manner from these two acting in common, not giving anything to them but receiving from them. This discussion of the Holy Spirit as bond through love shows that Bonaventure is oriented towards seeing the role of the Holy Spirit as mutual love of the Father and Son in terms of the Holy Spirit's being a kind of effect rather than cause of the Father and Son in their love.[187]

That the Spirit proceeds in a passive manner, however, does not entail a lack of actuality on the part of the Holy Spirit. His passivity does not connote a lack of actuality. In fact, to take seriously the theology of the finality of the Spirit as *complementum*—discussed above in Section 1.3— then the fullness of the actuality of the Holy Trinity in some ways can be almost appropriated to the Holy Spirit.

2.1.2.4 *I Sent*., d. 10, a. 2, q. 3: The Holy Spirit as Spirit

This final question asks if *spiritus* is proper to the Holy Spirit. The obvious difficulty is that if being "spirit" is proper to the third person, then what does that imply about the Father and the Son? Are they not "spirit"? They certainly cannot be corporeal or material. Bonaventure thus needs to articulate the way in which *spiritus* applies properly to the Spirit, without mitigating the spirituality of the divine essence.

To describe the way in which "spirit" applies properly to the Holy Spirit, Bonaventure first distinguishes the various ways in which something can be called "spirit." *Spiritus*, that is, can be said with respect to bodies, rational substances, and, most properly, to God. Moreover, "spirit" is taken

---

[187] Principe, "St. Bonaventure's Theology of the Holy Spirit," 258.

either from "spirituality" or "breathing" (*a spiritualitate aut a spiratione*).[188] Bonaventure then shows how this distinction applies to corporeal substances, rational substances, and to God.

In corporeal substances, "spirit"—*a spiritualitate*—is opposed to bodiliness. Thus a "subtle body" is called a spirit. On the other hand, "spirit"—*a spiratione*—refers to a breath (*flatus*).

In rational substances, "spirit"—*a spiritualitate*—refers, once again, to what is opposed to corporeality: "and in this way, a rational substance or its interior power is called spirit."[189] Taken *a spiratione*, however, "spirit" refers to the way in which the "affect (*affectus*) or love (*amor*) is called spirit."[190] The Seraphic Doctor explains why, and in so doing proffers a rather beautiful description of love:

> And the reason for this is because the act of breathing (*actus spirationis*) in a body is an internal act (*actus internus*), a continuous act (*actus continuus*), and a vivifying act (*actus vivificus*), and it has origin from heat (*a calore*). Because, therefore, the *egressus* of love, as it is love (*ut amor est*), comes from that which is intrinsic (*ab intrinseco*); and love is a vivifying act, because love is life; and again, love is a continuous act, because love should be continuously returned, and then it is perfect, when a human loves in this way; again, it is a spiritual heat: therefore, only love is said to be breathed forth spiritually.[191]

In terms of God, "spirit"—*a spiritualitate*—befits the whole Trinity, which lacks materiality and corporeality. Bonaventure cites John 4:24: "Spiritus est Deus."[192] In the second sense—*a spiratione*—the term befits only that divine person who proceeds *ut amor*. Love, however, may be pure or lustful. "Therefore," concludes Bonaventure, "that person, who is love, is not only called Spirit, but Holy Spirit."[193]

---

[188] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 3, resp. (1:204a).
[189] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 3, resp. (1:204a).
[190] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 3, resp. (1:204a).
[191] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 3, resp. (1:204ab).
[192] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 3, resp. (1:204b).
[193] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 3, resp. (1:204b).

2.2 *The Spirit: Pneumatology of Gift (I Sent., d. 18)*

Distinction 18 comprises Bonaventure's treatment of the Holy Spirit precisely as *donum*, a key pneumatological category inherited from the Augustinian tradition. This distinction consists of one article of six questions. In what follows, I attend to questions 1-5.[194] My treatment of this distinction will not be as thorough as that of distinction 10 above. The notion of gift, in terms of specifically articulating the *finality* of the Spirit within the Trinity, is not as crucial as love. Nevertheless, the Spirit as gift constitutes an important aspect to Bonaventure's pneumatology as a whole, and thus merits attention here.[195]

2.2.1 *I Sent.*, d. 18, au., q. 1: The Gift in Which All Other Gifts are Given

Bonaventure argues that the Spirit is the gift "in which all other gifts are given (*in quo omnia alia dona donantur*),"[196] To develop this, he makes a key distinction regarding the ablative of the phrase: "in which." The ablative may bespeak either accompaniment (*concomitantiam*) or causality (*causalitatem*).[197] Accordingly, the truth-value of the statement depends on the sense of the ablative.

If the ablative conveys accompaniment, the sense of the phrase can be understood either "universally" or "particularly." Taken universally, the phrase would be false. It would imply that the Holy Spirit is always given with every gift. Certain gifts, however, are given without the Holy Spirit, even

---

[194] I do not treat q. 6 (1:332-333), as it is primarily concerned with the way in which we can rightly use the term *noster* with respect to God and the divine persons. Strictly speaking, it does not add much to Bonaventure's pneumatology in terms of the specific goal of this study.

[195] For a brief overview of the significance of the name "Gift," see Hayes, "Introduction," 59-60.

[196] See Brambilla's synopsis of the history of this phrase in his "Lo Spirito agisce nella storia," 246 (n56). As far as I can tell, Bonaventure's precise formulation of this phrase (*in quo omnia alia dona donantur*) is only found in Odo Rigaldus before him (see Appendix Two of this study). Bonaventure utilizes this phrase more than once in his corpus: see, e.g., *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 2, fund. 2 and resp. (1:197a.198a); *I Sent.*, d. 14, a. 2, q. 1, fund. 3 (1:249a); *I Sent.*, d. 18, au., q. 1, fund. 1 and opp. 1 and resp. (1:323ab); *II Sent.*, d. 26, au., q. 2, ad 1 (2:636b); *III Sent.*, d. 27, a. 2, q. 1, fund. 5 (3:602b); *Itin.*, 6.2 (5:311a): "in quo cetera dona donantur."

[197] *I Sent.*, d. 18, au., q. 1, resp. (1:323b).

though others—like wisdom and charity—are in fact always accompanied by the Spirit. Taken particularly, the phrase is true because it would refer to *gratia gratis faciens*, the grace that renders one pleasing to God.[198] With this gift of grace, the Holy Spirit is always given.[199] Thus, the Holy Spirit accompanies all gifts of grace (*gratia gratis faciens*).

What about in terms of causality? Is the Holy Spirit the cause of all gifts given? Here, Bonaventure makes a triple distinction.[200] The ablative can entail causality in three different ways:

- "causality simply speaking (*simpliciter causalitatem*),"
- "causality and sub-authority (*causalitatem et subauctoritatem*)," or
- "causality and sub-authority and exemplarity (*causalitatem et subauctoritatem et exemplaritatem*)."[201]

In the first case, the phrase would apply to the whole Trinity. This first case of causality, as Paolo Brambilla rightly interprets, "wants to respect in an absolute sense … the principle that every operation *ad extra* of God is of the three divine persons."[202]

If causality is considered alongside sub-authority, then the phrase would apply to the Father "because the Father both through the Son and through the Holy Spirit gives."[203] The concept of sub-authority belongs to the theology of the divine missions *ad extra*: "to send" implies authority, and so "to be sent" implies "sub-authority."[204] Hence the Father has a certain authority over the Son and the Spirit whom he sends.

If causality and sub-authority is considered alongside exemplarity, then the phrase is said properly of the Holy Spirit: "For He proceeds through the mode of the first gift (*per modum primi doni*), in such a way that every right and gratuitous gift (*donatio*) is after it and receives from it the principle of the

---

[198] *I Sent.*, d. 18, au., q. 1, resp. (1:324a). Regarding Bonaventure's theology of grace, see Katherine Wrisley Shelby, *Spiraling Into God: Bonaventure on Grace, Hierarchy, and Holiness* (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America, 2023); José Miguel San Martin Gonzales, "Gratia," in *Dizionario Bonaventuriano*, 438-449. I treat in more detail Bonaventure's theology of grace in Part Two of this study.

[199] See also *Brev.*, 5.1-2 (5:252-254b).

[200] On this triple distinction, see Brambilla, "Lo Spirito agisce nella storia," 246-247.

[201] *I Sent.*, d. 18, au., q. 1, resp., (1:324a).

[202] Brambilla, "Lo Spirito agisce nella storia," 247.

[203] *I Sent.*, d. 18, au., q. 1, resp., (1:324a).

[204] See *Brev.*, 1.5.5 (5:214b).

gift (*rationem donationis*)."[205] Hence Bonaventure concludes: "It should thus be conceded, that the Holy Spirit is the gift, by which all gifts, namely gratuitous [gifts], are given through accompaniment, and by which all gifts of God are given through the cause of exemplarity."[206]

The Holy Spirit is the first gift—the fruit, the manifestation, the realization of the generous love of Father and Son. "Love is the gift," as Bonaventure had earlier remarked, "in which all other gifts are given."[207] The procession of love of the Holy Spirit is the procession of the first gift: the mutual love of the Father and the Son.[208] Within divine life lies the mystery of pure gratuity and generosity. As *donum*, the Spirit reveals the intense heterological inclination constitutive of Trinitarian being.

To contemplate this feature reveals just how utterly unique is the God of Jesus Christ: revelation of the Trinity reveals that *to be*—in its purest, most absolute and uncreated mode—is *to be as gift*, for it is Gift as hypostasis which constitutes the terminating completion of divine, trinitarian order. Gift illuminates the mystery of love itself.

2.2.2 *I Sent*., d. 18, au., q. 2-3: The Gift From All Eternity

The Spirit as gift, however, poses a potential problem. It would seem to bind the Spirit to creation insofar as the concept of "gift" necessitates a recipient. Bonaventure thus needs to specify the way in which the Spirit—as gift—does not entail a contingent relation to creation.

To explain, then, how the Spirit is *donum ab aeterno*, Bonaventure distinguishes in q. 2 three ways in which something is called "gift" in reference to a recipient. "Gift" is related to its recipient either as an act (*actum*), as habit (*habitum*), or in its capacity (*aptitudinem*). In the first case,

---

[205] *I Sent*., d. 18, au., q. 1, resp., (1:324a). See also *Itin*., 6.2 (5:311a), where Bonaventure identifies the diffusion through the mode of nature and of the will with the diffusion "through the mode of the Word, in which all things are spoken, and through the mode of the Gift, in which other gifts are given (*in quo cetera dona donantur*)."

[206] *I Sent*., d. 18, au., q. 1, resp., (1:324a).

[207] *I Sent*., d. 10, a. 1, q. 2, fund. 2 (1:197a). See also *I Sent*., d. 10, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (1:198a); *I Sent*., d. 18, au., q. 1, fund. 4 (1:323a).

[208] Bonaventure's pneumatology of gift is inseperable from his theology of the procession of the Spirit as a procession of love. Without the *processus amoris*, there would be no exemplary gift; see *I Sent*., d. 18, au., q. 1, ad 4 (1:324b).

something is called "gift" because it is given (*datur*). In the second case, something is called "gift" because it is to be given (*donandus*). In the third case, something is called "gift," because it is give-able (*donabilis*).[209]

According to the first way, the Spirit is gift in a solely temporal sense: the Spirit is given temporally to creatures. In the second and third sense, however, the Spirit can be called gift eternally. The Spirit, that is, will be given at some point (*donandum aliquando*). As *donabilis*, moreover, the Spirit is hypostatically constituted as give-able. Melone puts it nicely: "He [the Spirit] does not become gift when He is given in time, but proceeds from all eternity as gift because *donabile*, ordained to be given, regardless of whether or not this takes place."[210] Bonaventure's pneumatology of gift infuses a certain openness within divine life: from all eternity, God—while perfect and determined in no way whatsoever from any external principle— is open to be given.

Consequently, in q. 3, which asks whether *donum* or *datum* is more fittingly said of the Holy Spirit, Bonaventure prioritizes *donum*. The alternative—*datum*—connotes temporality, whereas *donum* does not necessarily possess such a temporal connotation. In addition, Bonaventure sees nestled within the term *donum* the concepts of *liberalitas* and *irreddibilitas*.[211] The name "gift" entails the utterly gratuitous nature of the Spirit's procession (*per modum liberalitatis*).[212]

2.2.3 *I Sent*., d. 18, au., q. 4-5: The Spirit is Personally Gift

The fourth question of d. 18 asks if the name "gift (*donum*)" is an essential name of the Divine Being or if it is proper to the Holy Spirit. Following Augustine, Bonaventure asserts: "gift (*donum*) is said in God properly or personally, not essentially, just as 'word' is said properly of the Son."[213] The term *datum*, however, can function either as an essential or a

---

[209] *I Sent*., d. 18, au., q. 2, resp. (1:325b).
[210] Melone, "*Donum in quo omnia alia dona donantur*," 61.
[211] *I Sent*., d. 18, au., q. 3, resp. (1:327a); see also fund. 4 (1:327a).
[212] See also *I Sent*., d. 18, au, q. 4, fund. 2 (1:328a).
[213] *I Sent*., d. 18, au., q. 4, resp. (1:328b).

personal predication: "For the whole Trinity gives itself, and yet the Father and the Son properly give the Holy Spirit."[214]

To flesh out his response, Bonaventure makes a threefold distinction to show how *datum* can be used in different senses. Firstly, the term *datum*, "by its very nature (*de sui ratione*)" means having been communciated (*communicatum*). "Therefore, what is given (*datum*) can be called communicated *ex liberalitate*, and thus, it is common to the entire Trinity," who freely gives itself. Secondly, *datum* can also refer to that which is communicated not only *ex liberalitate*, but also *ex auctoritate*. In this way, both the Son and the Spirit, who have a certain sub-authority with respect to the Father, are *datum*. They are given—sent—by the Father. Lastly, however, *datum* refers not only to that which is

> communicated *ex liberalitate et auctoritate*, but as that which is produced (*productum*) and in this way it is proper to the Holy Spirit, whose *proprium* is to proceed according to the principle of liberality (*rationem liberalitatis*), and thus according to the principle of gift or giftability (*doni vel donabilis*). And in this way *donum* and *datum* are equivalent. They differ, however, because *datum* bespeaks a communication in act, but *donum* in habit.[215]

The Holy Spirit is *datum* because he is *productum*.

In q. 5, then, Bonaventure asks if gift/giftability constitutes a distinctive property (*proprietas distinctiva*) of the Holy Spirit. Does *donum sive donabilitas* distinguish the Spirit from the other divine persons?[216]

To begin his response, Bonaventure introduces two possibile opinions. Each opinion considers exclusively only one pole of gift's dyadic structure. That is, "gift" implies a relation (*respectus*) both to the one-giving (*ad dantem*) and to the recipient (*ad eum cui datur*).[217] The first opinion, drawing from Augustine, considers *donum* insofar as it is related to the one-giving. This approach concludes that "gift" is a distinctive property, because it corresponds to the procession: "and in this way Augustine says that 'it is

---

[214] *I Sent.*, d. 18, au., q. 4, resp. (1:328b).
[215] *I Sent.*, d. 18, au., q. 4, resp. (1:328b).
[216] For a brief discussion on properties and persons in Bonaventure, see Paul Thom, *The Logic of the Trinity: Augustine to Ockham* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2012), 107-113. See also *I Sent.*, d. 26 and d. 39.
[217] *I Sent.*, d. 18, au., q. 5, resp. (1:330b).

called gift, by which it proceeds."[218] The second opinion considers *donum* insofar as it relates to the recipient. This approach concludes that "gift" is not a distinctive property, but is rather "consequent to the distinctive property (*consequens ad proprietatem distinctivam*)."[219] In sum: insofar that *donum* is considered according to its relation *ad dantem*, then it constitutes a distinctive property; insofar as it is considered according to its relation *ad eum cui datur*, then it does not constitute a distinctive property.[220]

After articulating these two opinions, Bonaventure comments: "But that does not seem to stand. For 'gift' always conveys something relative (*aliquam comparationem*) to the one to whom it is given. For, understanding that it is not give-able (*donabilis*) to anyone, it is impossible to understand that it is a gift."[221] It is not enough to understand *donum* without any sort of reference to a recipient. "Gift" needs to have some sort of relation *ad eum cui datur*. If "gift" is not give-able (*donabilis*), then there can be no "gift" to individuate: it would be incoherent to speak of "gift" without the corresponding pole of a recipient. Therefore, Bonaventure needs to find a way to include the second relation of gift's structure—i.e., *ad eum cui datur*—but without jeopardizing the status of *donum* as a distinctive property.

To attend to the second relation of gift's dyadic structure, Bonaventure thus recalls the threefold way—discussed already in d. 18, q. 2—in which "gift" relates to its recipient: *secundum actum*, *secundum habitum*, or *secundum aptitudinem*. This triple distinction provides Bonaventure with just what he needs. He can now articulate *donum* as a distinctive property, without however neglecting gift's dyadic structure:

> And this relation [i.e., *secundum aptitudinem = quia donabilis*] is so conjoined to the first [i.e., *respectum ad dantem*], that the first without this is not able to be understood; it rather follows necessarily—if it proceeds through the mode of gift—that it is give-able (*donabilis*): and therefore the following relation (*respectus*) does not take away from the first, but is rather the distinctive property. It should be said, therefore, that it [gift] is a distinctive property by reason of the first relation [=

---

[218] *I Sent.*, d. 18, au., q. 5, resp. (1:330b).
[219] *I Sent.*, d. 18, au., q. 5, resp. (1:330b).
[220] A relation (*respectus*) to creatures cannot constitute a distinctive property of a divine person, which must be distinguished prior to creation. See *I Sent.*, d. 18, au., q. 5, opp. 1 (1:330a).
[221] *I Sent.*, d. 18, au., q. 5, resp. (1:330b).

respectum ad dantem], without however being repugnant to the second relation, but consonant with it.[222]

In effect, Bonaventure fastens gift's relation to the recipient *secundum aptitudinem* to the first aspect of gift's dyadic structure, namely *ad dantem,* and thus to its origin. If there is a procession *per modum doni*, then there is *donabilitas*.

This feature, *donabilitas*, entails a robust heterology. A sense of alterity—implied by the *respectus ad eum cui datur*—is inbuilt in the Holy Spirit as gift. Bonaventure highlights this nuance in a response to a contrary argument, wherein he articulates the way in which the three different names of the third person—*spiritus*, *amor*, and *donum*—differ. In a word, they all refer to the same emanation, but "they name it differently."[223]

> For "spirit" designates it principally in reference to the producing power (*ad vim producentem*), which is a breathing power (*vis spirativa*); "love" [designates it] principally as to the mode of emanating, because [love is] as a bond (*nexus*); but "gift" [designates it] in terms of its consequent relation (*ad respectum consequentem*).[224]

While *donum* is a distinctive feature chiefly because of its relation *ad dantem*, which implies origin and emanation, it does not exclude *donabilitas* and thus its consequent, yet intrinsic, relation *ad eum cui datur*. *Donum* without *donabilitas*, without an intrinsic openness to the other, does not mean anything.

In the *Breviloquium*, Bonaventure also discusses these three names of the Holy Spirit. In that synthesis, it is precisely the gift-quality of the Spirit that colors the whole framework:

> In this way, it is proper that the Holy Spirit is gift, is the *nexus* or charity of both [the Father and the Son], and is the Holy Spirit. "Gift" names him as given (*datum*) freely (*voluntarium*); "Charity" or "*Nexus*,' as given (*datum*) freely and in a special way (*voluntarium et praecipuum*);

---

[222] *I Sent*., d. 18, au., q. 5, resp. (1:330b).
[223] *I Sent*., d. 18, au., q. 5, ad 4 (1:331b).
[224] *I Sent*., d. 18, au., q. 5, ad 4 (1:331b). Bonaventure continues to explain that something similar takes place in terms of the three names for the Second Person: *filius*, *imago*, and *verbum*.

and "Holy Spirit," as given (*datum*) freely, in a special way, and hypostatically (*voluntarium, praecipuum et hypostaticum*).[225]

Bonaventure develops here a pneumatology thoroughly centered on the concept of gift.[226] The Holy Spirit is properly the "gift" and is from all eternity *given* (*datum*). The Spirit realizes *ad intra* the mystery of gift.

Eternal openness to be given: this feature belongs to the very constitution of divine life. To be divine includes utter openness to be given to the other, even the yet non-existent other—i.e., creation.[227] The finality of divine life unveils itself as openness to the other. Uncreated being completes itself, so to speak, not by closing in on itself. Its completion lies rather in the infinite mystery of mutual love, which is, moreover, openness to something beyond itself. Enfolded within the theological tradition that views the Spirit as gift is, to echo Ratzinger, "an opening to history and to man. … The inner ground for creation and salvation history already lies in this mode of being of the Holy Spirit … The 'immanent' doctrine of Trinity is opened wholly to the 'economic.'"[228]

2.3 *The Spirit: Love of the Father and Son (I Sent., d. 32, a. 1)*

Multiple times throughout this study, reference has been made to the Holy Spirit as the love of the Father and Son, or as the love by which the Father and the Son love one another. Bonaventure discusses this theology explicitly in distinction 32, to which I now turn.

The idea that the Holy Spirit is the love by which the Father and Son love one another comes ultimately from St. Augustine and plays an important role in medieval pneumatology. To articulate this idea coherently and in an orthodox manner, however, is not so easy. Walter Principe begins his excellent article on Bonaventure's theology of the expression "Pater et Filius

---

[225] *Brev.*, 1.3.9 (5:212a).

[226] "La realtà più intima e più propria dello Spirito … è infatti la donazione." Melone, "Lo Spirito, dono di carità e guida alla verità," 58.

[227] Such utter openness to the other is also present, albeit in a different way, in the second person precisely understood as *Word*. See *In Ioann.*, 1.6 (6:247b).

[228] Ratzinger, "The Holy Spirit as Communio: Concerning the Relationship of Pneumatology and Spirituality in Augustine," *Communio: International Catholic Review* 25 (1998), 324-337 at 331.

diligunt se Spiritu sancto" with the following analysis, which succinctly yet astutely describes the difficulty of this phrase:

> Whether the Father and Son love each other "by the Holy Spirit" and, if so, how this is true, were questions that interested thirteenth-century theologians for many reasons. Texts of St. Augustine and the pseudo-Jerome on which the expression was based had been gathered by Peter Lombard in his *Sentences*. The Master of the Sentences, however, saw problems in this way of speaking. If to love and to be are identical in God, how can the Father and the Son be said to love each other by the Holy Spirit without its being implied that they have their being by that love and so are by the Holy Spirit? Moreover, had not St. Augustine denied the parallel expression, "Pater est sapiens sapientia quam genuit," because it would imply that the Father has his being from his begotten Wisdom? Having formulated these difficulties and yet being faced with clear texts from authorities affirming that the Father and Son love each other by the love which is not either of them but is the Holy Spirit, Peter Lombard simply confessed that the question was too difficult for him to unravel and invited his readers to try to find a solution.[229]

Before explicating Bonaventure's position, it would be helpful to provide a brief overview of some of the historical developments that preceded his synthesis. Principe individuates five different possible ways of interpreting the expression *Pater et Filius diligunt se Spiritu Sancto* that had "become standardized in the schools."[230]

1) A first possible solution Principe identifies as "the 'appropriation' opinion."[231] This position interprets "love" as an essential term, which is then appropriated to the Spirit.

2) A second possible solution Principe calls "the 'retraction' opinion." This solution claims that Augustine's retraction of "Pater est sapiens sapientia quam genuit" implicitly entails a consequent retraction of "Pater et Filius diligunt se Spiritu Sancto."[232] Neither of these first two solutions were found very satisfactory.

---

[229] Principe, "St. Bonaventure's Theology of the Holy Spirit," 243-244. Cf. Melone, "*Donum in quo omnia alia dona donantur*," 59. My analysis of d. 32, a. 1, q. 1-2 draws heavily from Principe's study. For his discussion of q. 1, see 258-262 and for q. 2, see 262-267 of his article.

[230] Principe, "St. Bonaventure's Theology of the Holy Spirit," 246.

[231] Principe attributes this solution to Gandolph of Bologna and Peter of Poitiers.

[232] Principe, "St. Bonaventure's Theology of the Holy Spirit," 247.

3) A third possible solution Principe labels "the 'sign' option." It was developed by Simon of Tournai. In brief, this solution holds that the Spirit is the sign of the love of the Father and the Son. Richard of St. Victor—an important source for Bonaventure's own position—develops a similar idea.[233]

4) A fourth possible solution Principe attributes to Praepositinus of Cremona. It claims that "the statement indicates the 'subauthority' (*subauctoritas*) of the Holy Spirit …. That is, the Holy Spirit is said to receive his ability to be an 'author' of love from the Father and Son, who are principle authors of love in God, so that the Holy Spirit's derived authorship is really a *subauctoritas*."[234]

5) A fifth possible solution comes from William of Auxerre. "He says that the love in question, which for him is the properly personal love which is the Holy Spirit, 'properly speaking informs' the Father and Son."[235] While utilizing the language of "form," William avoids the language of causality. In addition to the position developed by Richard of St. Victor, this position will also play a key role in Bonaventure's solution.

Aware of the rather simplistic nature of this summary of opinions, it nonetheless suffices to bring to light the general theological landscape out of which Bonaventure develops his own solution.

---

[233] Richard of St. Victor's *Quomodo Spiritus sanctus est amor Patris et Filii* is an important theological source for Bonaventure's synthesis, as will be made clear below. Bonaventure attributes this "sign" interpretation to Simon of Tournai, but considers his own solution to be the same proposed by Richard (though he mistakenly references Hugh of St. Victor), "who here saw the truth clearly" (*I Sent*., d. 32, a. 1, q. 2, resp. [1:560b]). See Melone's helpful study of Richard's influence on Bonaventure on this topic: "La recezione della teologia trinitaria di Riccardo di san Vittore," 150-155. Melone asserts that "l'influsso dottrinale del *Quomodo Spiritus sanctus* è fondamentale" (153).

[234] Principe, "St. Bonaventure's Theology of the Holy Spirit," 248.

[235] Principe, "St. Bonaventure's Theology of the Holy Spirit," 249. The quotation "properly speaking informs" comes from William's *Summa Aurea*, lib. 1, tract. 8, c. 7 (ed. Ribaillier, 149).

To begin his response, Bonaventure considers two of the aforementioned possible opinions, and reasons that they are inadequate. The first opinion considered is the "retraction" opinion. Even if, Bonaventure argues, Augustine had retracted the statement—which he did not—other authorities have continued to maintain it. Therefore, "this solution [i.e., the "retraction" opinion] is not able to stand."[236] The second opinion considered is the "appropriation" opinion. According to Bonaventure, it interprets the expression as follows: "The Father and Son love one another by the love, which is appropriated to the Holy Spirit."[237] This formulation, however, would also imply that: "The Father and the Son are good by the Holy Spirit, since goodness is appropriated to the Holy Spirit."[238] Obviously, Bonaventure cannot accept that position.

To develop his own position, Bonaventure first brings up the distinction between essential love and notional love.

> Love (*diligere*) can be taken essentially or notionally. Insofar as it is taken essentially, then it bespeaks the *voluntatis complacentiam*, which is common to the three. Insofar as it is taken notionally, then it bespeaks the fecundity of the will (*voluntatis fecunditatem*) to produce a person from itself (*ex se*). This fecundity is only in two [i.e., the Father and the Son who are prior in the order of origins], even though the will is in three.[239]

---

[236] *I Sent*., d. 32, a. 1, q. 1, resp. (1:557b).
[237] *I Sent*., d. 32, a. 1, q. 1, resp. (1:558a).
[238] *I Sent*., d. 32, a. 1, q. 1, resp. (1:558a).
[239] *I Sent*., d. 32, a. 1, q. 1, resp. (1:558a). One might say that the *voluntas complacentia* realizes, by virtue of their priority in the order of origins, a certain gravity in the Father and the Son and thus is fecund. This fecundity, in turn, manifests itself in the production of *amor personalis*. It is not necessary to develop this point at length, but a certain continuum between essential, notional, and personal love should be noted. The *fecunditas voluntatis*, which corresponds to the notional love of the Father and Son in spirating the Holy Spirit, cannot be, in the final analysis, totally abstracted from essential love. Some recourse to the essence is needed. Indeed, Bonaventure himself asserts that the will in the Father and the Son is one, "because the Father and the Son are one in substance" (*I Sent*., d. 11, q. 2, resp. [1:215b]). They are *unum principium* of spiration, insofar as "'one' bespeaks the unity of the notion [i.e., of the notional act of spiration] in reference (*in comparatione*), however, to the unity of nature and spirative power" (*I Sent*., d. 29, a. 2, q. 1, ad 1 [1:513b]). Nature and power is one in the Father and the Son, thus "the Father and the Son are one principle of the Holy Spirit, so that *unum* bespeaks the unity of notion and of the spirative power and of the nature in those spirating" (*I Sent*., d. 29, a. 2, q. 2, resp. [1:516a]). The Father and the Son spirate "by a single spiration and a single power and *in unitate naturae*" (*I Sent*., d. 29, a. 2, q. 2, ad 1 [1:516a]). See Obenauer, *Summa Actualitas*, 236-240.

If essential love is used to decode *diligere* in the phrase *Pater et Filius diligunt se Spiritu sancto*, the sense would be: "the Father and the Son are by the Holy Spirit."[240] This formulation construes the pronoun *se* "reciprocally," which implies that the Father loves himself by the Holy Spirit.[241] Interpreting *diligere* as essential love results in an improper construal.

Bonaventure opines, however, that if *diligere* refers to notional love, which bespeaks the fecundity of the will—in the Father and the Son—to produce a person, then the phrase is true. The pronoun *se*, in this case, would be construed not reciprocally, but "retransitively." In Bonaventure's words:

> And in this sense, the pronoun is construed with the verb retransitively. Hence the sense is: *Pater et Filius diligunt se*, that is, the Father loves the Son and the Son [loves] the Father; and then the expression is true, because love, which is the Holy Spirit, is the love connecting (*amor nectens*) the Father with the Son and vice versa; and thus it is not permitted to infer that, therefore, the Father loves himself by the Holy Spirit.[242]

Bonaventure's argument emphasizes the significance of the Spirit's role as *nexus*. The Spirit is the love by which the Father and the Son love one another precisely as *nexus*.

To unpack further Bonaventure's position, I turn now to his responses to the first three contrary arguments, to which three he responds at the same time. Here is a brief summary of the three opposing arguments:

- *Opp. 1.* "To love" and "to will the good" are the same. But "to will" is the same as "to be" in God. Since it is false that the Father and the Son *are* by the Holy Spirit, then it is false that the Father and Son *love* one another by the Holy Spirit.[243]
- *Opp. 2.* The phrase *Pater et Filius diligunt se Spiritu sancto* is false for the same reason that the phrase "Pater est sapiens sapientia genita" is false.[244]

---

[240] *I Sent.*, d. 32, a. 1, q. 1, resp. (1:558a).
[241] *I Sent.*, d. 32, a. 1, q. 1, resp. (1:558a).
[242] *I Sent.*, d. 32, a. 1, q. 1, resp. (1:558a).
[243] *I Sent.*, d. 32, a. 1, q. 1, opp 1 (1:557a).
[244] *I Sent.*, d. 32, a. 1, q. 1, opp. 2 (1:557ab).

- *Opp. 3.* Just as it is false to say "the Father loves himself (*se*) by the Holy Spirit," so it is also false to say it of both the Father and Son.[245]

In light of Bonaventure's response above, his answer to these objections should not come as a surprise. The problem with the first contrary argument is that it interprets *diligere* essentially. Similarly, the problem with the second argument is that, while *diligere* can be said essentially or notionally, *sapere* is said either commonly of the three or as an appropriation. *Sapere* cannot, however, be taken notionally. With respect to the third argument, it construes the pronoun *se* reciprocally and *diligere* essentially.[246]

The third contrary argument, however, includes a follow-up ("Si dicas..."). It argues that *diligere* cannot be said notionally. To respond, Bonaventure develops further his overall position.

> It should be understood that just as generation can be signified in two ways—in one way, so that it designates emanation, and in another way, so that it designates the mode of emanation with an added expression; and in the first way [i.e., emanation], [generation is signified] through this verb: "to generate" (*generare*); in the second way [i.e., mode of emanation], it is signified through this verb: "to say" (*dicere*)—so also can spiration be signified in two ways. In the first way [spiration is signified] through this verb, which is "to spirate" (*spirare*); in the second way [spiration is signified] through this verb which is "to love" (*diligere*).[247]

In this passage, Bonaventure distinguishes between emanation and mode of emanation. He makes this distinction in order to correlate *dicere*, which speaks to the mode of the Son's emanation, with *diligere*, which speaks to the mode of the Spirit's emanation. Bonaventure continues:

> For just as "to say" conveys generation and, in addition, a certain expression regarding the person, so also does "to love." Whence just as "to say" implies the act of generating and of declaring or expressing (*declarandi sive exprimendi*)—and it is said by reason of the act of

---

[245] *I Sent.*, d. 32, a. 1, q. 1, opp. 3 (1:557b). As indicated by Principe's passage quoted above, the Lombard had struggled to resolve the issues raised by the first two arguments. See Peter Lombard, *I Sent.*, d. 32, c. 1-2 and 6 (ed. Brady 1:232-234 and 238-239).

[246] *I Sent.*, d. 32, a. 1, q. 1, ad 1.2.3 (1:558a). Principe ("St. Bonaventure's Theology of the Holy Spirit," 262) notes: "The clarification of the terminology of love accomplished over the preceding decades renders Lombard's problems almost insignificant for Bonaventure."

[247] *I Sent.*, d. 32, a. 1, q. 1, ad 1.2.3 (1:558b).

declaring (*actus declarandi*) [that]: "The Father speaks himself by the Word," that is, that by declaring or expressing himself he generates the Word, or by generating the Word he expresses himself by the Word— so also, in the statement [the Father and the Son love *se* by the Holy Spirit], "to love" implies the act of connecting or of harmonizing and spirating (*connectendi sive concordandi et spirandi*), and it is said by reason of the act of connecting [that]: "The Father and the Son love one another by the Holy Spirit," that is, by being in harmony together (*invicem concordando*) they spirate (*spirant*) the Holy Spirit, or by spirating the Holy Spirit they are connected together (*invicem connectuntur*).[248]

In effect, Bonaventure parallels the phrase "The Father speaks himself by the Word" with "The Father and the Son love one another by the Holy Spirit." Furthermore, while both *spirare* and *diligere* ultimately signify *spiratio*, "to love" conveys the idea that by breathing forth the Holy Spirit in a notional act of perfect harmony, the Father and the Son are connected together. To say, therefore, that the Father and the Son love one another by the Holy Spirit is to say: the Father and Son, by being in harmony together, spirate Love; concurrently, in spirating, they are connected totally in Love. To echo Melone's fine analysis:

> The Father and the Son, being in agreement in love, spirate the Spirit, and, at the same time, by spirating the Spirit, they realize the unity and concord of love between themselves. In this sense, therefore, the Holy Spirit is the bond of the Father and the Son: he is the love in which one loves and tends towards the other, their communion, harmony, the encounter of one in the other (*dell'uno nell'altro*).[249]

2.3.2 *I Sent*., d. 32, a. 1, q. 2: How to Take the Ablative?

In order to explicate the phrase *Pater et Filius diligunt se Spiritu sancto*, Bonaventure had argued that *diligere* constitutes a notional term. The phrase thus describes the notional act of spiration, namely, the harmonious breathing forth of the Spirit who is the bond of love. In this act, the Father and the Son are connected. Bonaventure's treatment, however, is not yet complete. If in question 1, the focus was on the verb, Bonaventure now turns his attention to

---

[248] *I Sent*., d. 32, a. 1, q. 1, ad 1.2.3 (1:558b).
[249] Melone, "*Donum in quo omnia alia dona donantur*," 59-60.

the ablative in the phrase. What does it mean to say "by the Holy Spirit (*Spiritu sancto*)"?

To answer this question, Bonaventure first discusses two of the previous possible solutions put forth prior to him. The first is the "sign" option. According to this solution, "the sense of the expression is: the Father and the Son love one another; and the sign (*signum*) of this is that they harmoniously (*concorditer*) spirate the Holy Spirit, who is unique and indivisible."[250] Bonaventure does not accept this interpretation. It could entail that the Father and the Son also love each other by a created love, insofar that a created love could be a sign of their love. The "sign" option is not robust enough. Furthermore, it would also infer that "the Father is wise by begotten wisdom, since begotten wisdom is maximally a sign (*signum*) of the wisdom in the generating Father."[251]

Next, Bonaventure considers the possible solution advanced by William of Auxerre. This solution posits that the ablative "is construed according to the nature of a form (*in ratione formae*)."[252] Accordingly, "to love one another (*diligere se*) is nothing other than, said about the Father and the Son, to be connected together (*invicem connecti*)."[253] Bonaventure continues to explain this proposal:

> And since by a *nexus* they are formally connected, and the Holy Spirit is that *nexus*; therefore, speaking formally, this is true: "the Father and the Son love one another by the Holy Spirit," just as this is formally true: "the Father and the Son are bound by a bond (*nectuntur nexu*)."[254]

In other words, the Father and the Son love one another and in this are bound together by the *nexus* that is the Holy Spirit.

Bonaventure gives his evaluation. In so doing, he begins to craft his own opinion, as well:

> But this position as a whole cannot stand, because when it is said "the Father and the Son are bound (*nectuntur*)," being-bound (*nectuntur*) conveys something, which is in the Father and the Son from the Holy

---

[250] *I Sent.*, d. 32, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (1:560a).
[251] *I Sent.*, d. 32, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (1:560a).
[252] *I Sent.*, d. 32, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (1:560a).
[253] *I Sent.*, d. 32, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (1:560ab).
[254] *I Sent.*, d. 32, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (1:560b).

Spirit (*a Spiritu sancto*), or which is in them as a principle of the Holy Spirit.[255]

Bonaventure does not deny that the Father and the Son are bound, but he seeks greater precision. If they are bound together by the Holy Spirit, it is either because 1) they receive something from the Holy Spirit or 2) because they are themselves the principle of the Holy Spirit.

The first option is unacceptable. If they receive something from the Holy Spirit, then, by dint of divine simplicity, they would receive *totum* from the Spirit. It would thereby follow that they *are* by the Holy Spirit—a conclusion, which Bonaventure will not allow.

Consequently, they must then be bound insofar as they are principle of the Holy Spirit. Accordingly, even though the verb *nectuntur*—in the sentence: "the Father and the Son *nectuntur*"—is in the passive mode, it communicates something active.[256] Accordingly, the Father and Son are connected, not because they receive something from the Holy Spirit, but because they are the principle of the Holy Spirit.

While Bonaventure had rejected both the "sign" and the "form" option, he now nuances his rejection. In a word, the "sign" option had said too little and the "form" option had said too much. "Although neither is altogether sufficient, yet each contains something of the truth."[257] The "sign" option rightly regards the Spirit as produced by the Father and the Son. The "form" option rightly affirms that "love is compared to the lovers in terms of form (*ut in ratione formae*)."[258]

Having identified what is true in each case, Bonaventure now presents his *positio media*: "that ablative is construed under the reason of a formal effect (*effectus formalis*)."[259] Bonaventure, though he incorrectly ascribes this position to Hugh of St. Victor, is drawing from Richard of St. Victor's

---

[255] *I Sent*., d. 32, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (1:560b).
[256] Recall the distinction made in d. 10, a. 2, q. 2 that certain verbs may have a passive signification even if said in the active voice.
[257] *I Sent*., d. 32, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (1:560b).
[258] *I Sent*., d. 32, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (1:560b).
[259] *I Sent*., d. 32, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (1:560b).

Quomodo Spiritus sanctus est amor Patris et Filii. Richard, however, does not use the specific term *effectus formalis*.[260]

The key Victorine insight lies in the distinction between the subject who loves and the love that proceeds forth from him. This love that comes from the one-loving is the love by which the subject loves.[261] With Richard's text clearly in the background, Bonaventure remarks: "when it is said: 'I love you by a love proceeding from me,' there is the construction in terms of a formal effect (*in ratione effectus formalis*)."[262]

Of course, an obvious difference separates human love from what takes place in God: "the love proceeding from you is in you resting as uniting and inhering, because it is accidental; but in God the love proceeding from the Father and the Son is in them resting as unifying, not however as inhering, because it is not accidental, but substance and hypostasis: and therefore it has less of the reason of form (*rationem formae*)."[263] Love is more "formal" in the case of human love because it does not realize itself hypostatically—as is the case in God. Melone offers a fine synthesis of Bonaventure's use of Richard:

> The key argument that Bonaventure takes from the *Quomodo Spiritus sanctus* in this context is the interpretation of the act of loving united to the distinction between love that proceeds as an accident and that which coincides with the essence. Richard, in fact, had clearly affirmed that one can interpret the expression "I love you with a love proceeding from me" in the sense that the love that proceeds from the subject (*effectus*) is that which realizes the act of loving (*formalis*). Yet while the human soul is not in itself love, but is that from which love proceeds, the Father and the Son, on the other hand, are love and therefore … they love

---

[260] Principe had originally postulated that *effectus formalis* was Bonaventure's original contribution to the discussion (see "St. Bonaventure's Theology of the Holy Spirit," 265). In a helpful footnote (n65), Principe draws attention to the term *quasi forma* in the *Summa Halensis* and *quasi effectus* in Albert the Great. In a subsequent article, however, Principe showed that the term *effectus formalis* cannot be ascribed originally to Bonaventure as it is found also in Odo Rigaldus, as well as in an anonymous *Commentary on the Sentences*. See Principe, "Odo Rigaldus, A Precursor of St. Bonaventure on the Holy Spirit as *effectus formalis* in the Mutual Love of the Father and Son," *Mediaeval Studies* 39 (1977): 498-505. Further research is still needed to pinpoint the first use of this term.

[261] "The human soul (*animus*) is not love, but from it love (*amor*) proceeds, and therefore it does not love by its very self (*seipso non diligit*), but by the love (*amore*) which proceeds from its very self (*a seipso*). The Father is love, and the Holy Spirit is his love, and thus the Father loves by his very self, he loves by the Holy Spirit." *Quomodo Spiritus Sanctus*, in *Opuscules Théologiques* (ed. Ribaillier, 165).

[262] *I Sent.*, d. 32, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (1:560b).

[263] *I Sent.*, d. 32, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (1:560b-561a).

through the love that they are in themselves and through the love that has origin from them—the Holy Spirit. And for this reason, in God love can be both *substance and person* at the same time.[264]

To flesh out Bonaventure's position, it would be helpful to consider his responses to the opposing arguments. He responds to the first two together. The first two contrary arguments take issue with the idea that a divine person loves formally by another person. It would seem to imply love by participation or that—without reference to the Holy Spirit—one could not conceive that the Father loves.[265] To respond, Bonaventure asserts that love through participation obtains only when the act of loving by another is through the essence. "But in the case of the Father and the Son," to borrow from Principe's helpful explanation, "it is loving by another as a person and therefore it is not a participated love."[266] Bonaventure proceeds to quote Richard's *Quomodo Spiritus Sanctus*: "The human soul is not love, but from it love proceeds, therefore it does not love by means of itself (*se ipso non diligit*); but the Father is love and the Holy Spirit is his love, therefore he loves by his very self (*diligit se ipso*); he loves also by the Holy Spirit."[267] The Father, in other words, loves by himself—"and therefore not by participation"[268]—and at the same time, he loves by "his love" that is the Holy Spirit. It is, therefore, also possible to conceive the Father loving in terms of essential love (*se ipso*) without immediately calling to mind the Holy Spirit.

Bonaventure's response is insightful. Ultimately, love is ecstatic: in God, the inclination of love that stretches forth (*tendere*) toward the other is thus hypostatic. So while the Father loves *se ipso*, this love reaches fulfillment, as it were, hypostatically in the *amor personalis* that is the Holy Spirit. Unlike human love, love in God does not remain in the will but finds perfect and infinite manifestation in the Spirit.

---

[264] Melone, "La recezione della teologia trinitaria di Riccardo di san Vittore," 155. See also Melone, "*Donum in quo omnia alia dona donantur*," 59-60.

[265] See *I Sent*., d. 32, a. 1, q. 2, opp. 1 and 2 (1:559b-560a).

[266] Principe, "St. Bonaventure's Theology of the Holy Spirit," 266.

[267] *I Sent*., d. 32, a. 1, q. 2, ad 1.2 (1:561a). See n261 above.

[268] Principe, "St. Bonaventure's Theology of the Holy Spirit," 266.

The third and fourth opposing arguments concern the concept of the Holy Spirit as form. For example, the third argument states that "no hypostasis is a form; but love, which is the Holy Spirit, is a hypostasis."[269]

In his response, Bonaventure has no intention to argue that the hypostasis of the Spirit is a form. The formal quality expressed by the ablative does not equate entirely with the notion of form precisely because the Holy Spirit is a hypostasis. Recall, again, the example of human love: the love inheres in the subject but does not proceed forth hypostatically as it does in God. Bonaventure specifies that the ablative *Spiritu sancto* designates not the act of form insofar as it inheres in the subject, but rather the act of the form insofar as it is to unite.[270]

According to the fifth opposing argument, the Holy Spirit cannot be the form of the loving of the Father and Son because that would imply the Spirit is antecedent to—rather than the product of—the Father and the Son's act of loving.[271]

To respond, Bonaventure grants that this argument works *if* form is taken causally. The Holy Spirit, however, is not the formal cause of the love of the Father and the Son. In the statement *Pater et Filius diligunt se Spiritu sancto* the ablative does not express causality "because it is construed through the mode of a formal effect (*effectus formalis*)."[272] Accordingly, so Bonaventure concludes, there is both the reason of the form (*ratio formae*) and also the reason of a sign (*ratio signi*).

Before moving on to the next section, a word about the consistency of Bonaventure's theology seems at this point apposite. Specifically, the theology developed here coheres well with the theology of procession—*ab alio in alium*—in at least two ways. First, by construing the pronoun *se* retransitively, the framework of procession itself emerges. In brief, construing *se* retransitively resulted in the following construction: A → B and B → A.[273]

---

269 *I Sent.*, d. 32, a. 1, q. 2, opp. 3 (1:560a).

270 "But there the ablative falls away from (*cadit ab*) the act of the form, which is to inhere (*inhaerere*), and holds on to the act of the form (*tenet actum formae*), which is to unite (*unire*)." *I Sent.*, d. 32, a. 1, q. 2, ad 3.4 (1:561b).

271 *I Sent.*, d. 32, a. 1, q. 2, opp. 5 (1:560a).

272 "*I Sent.*, d. 32, a. 1, q. 2, ad 5 (1:561a).

273 Cf. Corneille H. Kneepkens, "Transitivity, Intransitivity and Related Concepts in 12th Century Grammar: An Explorative Study," in *De ortu grammaticae: Studies in Medieval*

That is, the Father loves the Son and the Son loves the Father. Herein lies the basic framework of procession: from the Father into the Son (*ut obiectum*) and from the Son into the Father (*ut obiectum*). One thus perceives here the "circularity" of divine life discussed earlier in this chapter. Second: as *effectus formalis*, the Spirit surfaces not only as the ecstatic culminating manifestation of the *fecunditas voluntatis* of the Father and the Son, but also as their connective *nexus*. The Spirit is *effectus* because he comes from the Father and the Son, who together are *unum principium*. Yet, the Spirit is not just an effect, but the *formal* effect, which regards "the act of the form, which is to unite."[274] This formality, to draw once more from Melone,

> signifies that the completion (*compimento*) … of the love of the Father and the Son is given uniquely by his [the Spirit's] proceeding … The Father and the Son, by being in harmony in love, spirate the Spirit, and at the same time, precisely by spirating the Spirit they realize between them the unity and the concord of love.[275]

By spirating, they are connected: the Father breathes into the Son and the Son breathes into the Father and in this eternal, mutual, and hypostatic breath lies their connective *nexus* who is Love.

3. The Finality of Communion: Understanding Unity in a Trinitarian Way

In the previous section, I explicated the shape of Bonaventure's pneumatology as articulated in his *Commentarius in Primum Librum Sententiarum*. I now develop forward this theology. I show how Bonaventure's theology of the Holy Spirit nuances the way in which to think about the essential unity of Divine Being. To contemplate the Spirit's finality is to contemplate something of the very communion of the Trinity.

I begin with a quotation from Luis Ladaria's manual of trinitarian theology:

Grammar and Linguistic Theory in Memory of Jan Pinborg, ed. G. L. Bursill-Hill et al. (Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 1990), 161-189.

[274] See n270 above.

[275] Melone, "*Spiritus sanctus facit nos similes illi summae Trinitate*," 130.

Unity and distinction are not then contradictory. The unique divine essence should not be seen in opposition to the plurality of persons, nor as prior to them, but can be considered as the same unity and communion between them, which does not mean that this unity is a consequence of the union of the three. Unity and trinity are both absolutely primary and original, none is "previous" to the other.[276]

Ladaria accentuates that the essential unity of the Divine Being can be nothing other than the unity of the three divine persons.

Bonaventure's trinitarian theology in general and his pneumatology in particular corroborate and contribute to just such a vision. The Seraphic Doctor provides a certain framework to think about divine unity in a specifically trinitarian—and pneumatological—way.

3.1 *The Pneumatological Mystery of Divine Unity*

In the Holy Spirit lies the realization of the loving fecundity of God. The Holy Spirit completes the Trinity because the Holy Spirit is the *nexus* of the Father and the Son. Distinction culminates in communion—in the Spirit who is the *unitas* or *caritas amborum*.[277] As *nexus*, the Spirit realizes the "communion through the unity of those who are distinct."[278] Triune plurality manifests the communal depth of divine unity.

Bonaventure's pneumatology thereby nuances the meaning of divine unity. While respecting the grammar of trinitarian theology as well as the important distinction between essential and personal predication, for Bonaventure, divine unity *can only be* trinitarian unity. Rik Van Nieuwenhove captures well Bonaventure's project:

> For Bonaventure, therefore, the issue is not a choice between emphasis upon oneness of the divine nature on one hand and threeness of the divine Persons on the other. In his understanding, … oneness and threeness do not exclude but rather strengthen one another. It is only in the divine Persons that we find the unity. There is nothing but the

---

[276] Ladaria, *The Living and True God: The Mystery of the Trinity*, trans. María Isabel Reyna and Liam Kelly (Miami: Convivium Press, 2010), 413.

[277] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 2, resp. (1:202b); *Brev.*, 1.3.9 (5:212a).

[278] "Charity does not only bespeak community (*communitatem*), because it is in many, but communion (*communionem*) through the unity of those who are distinct (*unitatem distinctorum*)." *I Sent.*, d. 10, dub. 6 (1:207b). See Melone, "*Donum in quo omnia alia dona donantur*," 57-58.

Persons and each of these Persons is of one essence, which is utterly simple.[279]

In a word, there is not some primitive essential unity that is prior to, or an ensuing essential unity that is the result of, the mystery of personal plurality.[280] "Neither does the Trinity prejudge (*praeiudicat*) the Unity, nor does the Unity prejudge the Trinity. Rather the Unity pertains (*spectat*) to the perfection (*perfectionem*) of the Trinity, and the Trinity to the Unity."[281]

Such a perspective emerges clearly in Bonaventure's *De mysterio Trintiatis*. The text's two-article structure itself manifests that the divine attributes of the *esse divinum* find their fullest disclosure in the *esse divinum et trinum*.[282] As Sergio Bonanni has argued, the project of this text is to grasp "unity and trinity in their inalienable co-originality."[283]

Thus, in his treatment of divine unity, Bonaventure argues that highest unity (*summa unitas*) is revealed precisely in the mystery of trinitarian communion. As Carmelo Pandolfi has remarked, for Bonaventure, "God is One, not despite, but *per* the Trinity."[284] The mysteries of a trinity of persons and a unity of essence do not clash: they manifest a "marvelous concord."[285] And, as mentioned above,[286] *concordia* cannot but call to mind the Holy Spirit, the person in whom the personal distinction of Father and Son terminates in the binding and unitive love of charity.

Indeed, Bonaventure states explicitly that the unity of the three divine persons renders more perfect the whole concept of a unity of nature in itself.

---

[279] Van Nieuwenhove, *Introduction to Medieval Theology*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge – New York: Cambridge University Press, 2022), 239.

[280] See *Myst. Trin.*, q. 2, a. 2, ad 15 (5:67b): "That the Father generates, and that the Son is generated, and that the Holy Spirit proceeds is not something other than: the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are (*esse*), and one is in them *esse*." See also the significant repetition of *quae est* in *Itin.*, 6.2 (5:311a), where Bonaventure speaks of the "purity of goodness, *quae est* the pure act of the principle who in charity loves with a love that is gratuitous, with a love that is due, and with a love that is a mixture of both, *quae est* the most full diffusion through the mode of nature and of will, *quae est* the diffusion through the mode of the Word … and through the mode of the Gift."

[281] *II Sent.*, d. 9, praenotata (2:238a).

[282] See n3 of Chapter One above.

[283] Bonanni, "*Generatio est ratio communicandi essentiam*," 579. On this point, a Christian trinitarian metaphysics thus fundamentally distances itself from the synthesis of pagan Greek philosophy, as well as the teachings of Islam and the religious traditions of the East, wherein singular unity in one way or another constitutes the Absolute.

[284] Pandolfi, "Le parole di Dio nella parola di Dio," 119.

[285] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 2, a. 2, resp. (5:65a).

[286] See my comments at the end of Section 1.3 of this chapter.

A unity of charity, which entails some kind of plurality and distinction, is more complete and perfect than a unity confined to singularity:

> More perfect (*perfectior*) is unity, in which with a unity of nature there remains a unity of charity (*unitas caritatis*); but "charity stretches forth toward another": therefore, it includes the distinction of the one loving and the beloved (*diligentis et dilecti*); therefore if the divine unity is most perfect, it is necessary that it have an intrinsic plurality.[287]

The *unitas caritatis* constitutes a reference to the Holy Spirit—who, in this passage, is the unsaid yet implicitly present *condilectus* of the lover and beloved (*diligentis et dilecti*).[288] The love that consummates charity—i.e., the *condilectus*—is the love that renders perfect the unity of the Trinity. In the *unitas caritatis*, as Obenauer observes, "the divine unity possesses its form of completion."[289] The "completion" of the Trinity is the *unitas caritatis*: the finality of the Holy Spirit is perfective (*perfectior*). Bonaventure's theology of the *unitas caritatis* realizes the proposal put forth by Ladaria above.

Ultimately, then, the Spirit "terminates the divine persons" because the Spirit brings to perfection the mystery of divine unity that finds its perfection in the Trinity (*spectat ad perfectionem Trinitati*).[290] In the Spirit one sees the fullness of the Father and the Son in their love for one another. Furthermore, in the Holy Spirit lies the perfect *reductio ad primam* in the Father: the intelligible circle returns to the beginning and is made perfect.[291]

A theology of divine unity without revelation of the triune mystery thereby remains imperfect and hence incomplete.[292] Unity without love is wanting. The Holy Spirit—Charity stretching forth—draws the loving Father and the beloved Son into unity. "The trinitarian identity (*Ineins*)," writes Freyer, "of unity and difference takes place now in the Spirit, who is the '*nexus*,' the bond, the mutual love between the Father and the Son."[293]

---

[287] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 2, a. 2, fund. 9 (5:65a). See Obenauer, *Summa Actualitas*, 207-208.
[288] See n77 in Chapter Two above.
[289] Obenauer, *Summa Actualitas*, 208.
[290] See n281 above.
[291] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 2, a. 2, ad 17 (5:65b).
[292] "Por ello [Buenaventura], si la unidad divina posee la máxima perfección, es necesario que tenga una pluralidad intrínseca." Ladaria, "*Fons et origo*. Monoteísmo y 'monarquía' del Padre," in *Doctor honoris causa excmo. y revdmo. P. Luis F. Ladaria Ferrer* (Salamanca: Universidad Pontifica de Salamanca, 2014), 44.
[293] Freyer, "Der Hl. Geist," 49.

3.2 *The Circle of Divine Life: Relational Perfection*

At various times throughout this study, reference has been made to Bonaventure's concept of the intelligible circle. Bonaventure uses this image, though not exclusively, to describe the divine life. It is a Trinitarian image. To conceive of divine life as an intelligible circle is to conceive of divine life in a fundamentally relational way.

God is an "intelligible circle" because God is maximally perfect (*perfectissimum*) and simple (*simplicissimum*).[294] For Bonaventure, however, the metaphysics of perfection and simplicity include intrinsic plurality. Consequently, he enfolds within the structure of the neoplatonic image of the circle the Christian mystery of divine plurality.

Bonaventure hints at the intersection between the circle and relational plurality in a fascinating use of the *Liber de Causis*' notion of a complete return (*reditione completa*), to which he makes a passing reference in the *Breviloquium*. Before quoting the relevant passage, a brief word about this term in the *Liber de Causis* is necessary. In the *Liber de Causis*, the *reditio completa* conveys that an essence is "fixed through itself" and does not depend on anything extrinsic.[295] As Therese Scarpelli Cory observes, the *reditio completa* evokes the "common image of perfection, i.e., the sphere rotating around its fixed center. … Rotation thus illustrates unity, self-sufficiency, and teleological completeness; a rotating sphere is not moving somewhere that it is not, but remains centered in itself, always having reached the 'end' of its motion even while it continues to move."[296] Accordingly, "'to return to *one's own* essence' is to have a sort of independence—ontologically

---

[294] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 3, a. 1, resp. (5:70b).

[295] "And I do not mean (*significo*) by the return of the substance to its essence anything other than that it is standing (*est stans*), fixed through itself (*fixa per se*), not requiring in its fixity and its essence another thing to hold it up (*rigente*), since it is a simple substance, sufficient in and of itself (*per seipsam*)." *Liber de Causis* XIV (XV), 128 (Adriaan Pattin, "Le *Liber de Causis*: Édition Établie À L'Aide de 90 Manuscrits avec Introduction et Notes," *Tijdschrift voor Filosofie* 28 [1966]: 90-203 at 167).

[296] Therese Scarpelli Cory, "*Reditio completa, reditio incompleta*: Aquinas and the *Liber de Causis*, Prop. 15, On Reflexivity and Incorporeality," in *Appropriation, Interpretation and Criticism: Philosophical and Theological Exchanges Between the Arabic, Hebrew and Latin Intellectual Traditions*, ed. Alexander Fidora and Nicola Polloni (Barcelona – Roma: Fédération Internationale des Instituts d'Études Médiévales, 2017), 185-229 at 195.

insofar as it is self-subsisting."[297] When Bonaventure thus speaks of a *reditio completa*, he has something in mind akin to perfection, completeness, utter independence.

This image, for Bonaventure, is also—one might say: *therefore*—trinitarian. In the *Breviloquium*, he writes:

> The first and supreme unity (*unitas prima et summa*), returning (*rediens*) upon itself by a complete and perfect return (*reditione completa et perfecta*), is most omnipotent (*omnipotentissima*), and in the same way truth (*veritas*) [returning upon itself by a complete and perfect return is] most wise (*sapientissima*), and goodness (*bonitas*) [returning upon itself by a complete and perfect return is] most benevolent (*benevolentissima*); and these are appropriated, because they indicate (*insinuare*) order.[298]

How might we interpret this passage? In effect, Bonaventure renders trinitarian the perfection and self-subsistence of the *reditio completa*. Each divine person—intimated by the appropriations *unitas*, *veritas*, and *bonitas* which convey order—is hypostatically *in se*: independent, subsistent, and fully in act. Yet, Bonaventure relationalizes the meaning of these terms. He shows that hypostatic independence or fixity is to be in relation. A person is only a person in communion. "A person cannot exist alone," writes Hellmann.[299]

Consequently, "unity," in its complete return to itself—i.e., in its metaphysical perfection—is *omnipotentissima*. This term, however, ultimately betrays the Father's infinite fecund productivity realized in the generation of the Son and spiration of the Spirit. Unity insinuates personal plurality. In its hypostatic fixity, unity is completely and utterly fecund and hence relational. Likewise, "truth," in its complete return to itself is *sapientissima*. This term speaks ultimately to the centrality of the second person, within which is enfolded the whole mystery of triune life: "sapientia ponit Trinitatem."[300] Lastly, "goodness," in its complete return to itself is

---

[297] Therese Scarpelli Cory, "What Is an Intellectual 'Turn'? The *Liber de Causis*, Avicenna, and Aquinas's Turn to Phantasms," *Tópicos* 45 (2013), 129-162 at 137 (emphasis in original).
[298] *Brev.*, 1.6.5 (5:215b).
[299] Hellmann, *Divine and Created Order*, 49.
[300] *Brev.*, 1.2.5 (5:211b).

benevolentissima, which speaks to the finality of triune life.[301] Hence Bonaventure goes on to explain that *voluntas* presupposes both cognition and power, and that the perfection or culmination of unity (power) and truth (cognition) terminates in the—*benevolentissima*—will. Indeed, the Holy Spirit has the *rationem finiendi*, "because 'the good and the end are the same.'"[302]

Bonaventure's use of the *reditio completa* reveals the trinitarian structure that undergirds the metaphysics of perfection, complete actuality, utter independence. The circularity of divine life is trinitarian. And enfolded—here the concept of the implicate order is again helpful—within the hypostatic perfection of each person lies heterological orientation, relationality, and the mystery of the infinite other.

The Trinity of persons manifests the perfection of the intelligible circle that is divine life.

3.3 *Ut unum sint: Christ's Prayer for and Revelation of the Spirit (unitas caritatis)*

To develop this insight regarding the trinitarian color of divine unity further, I now turn specifically to Bonaventure's commentary on John 17, the so-called High Priestly Prayer of Jesus. In what follows, I highlight select aspects of his commentary in order to show that Christ's prayer "that they may be one as we are one" is a prayer for the Holy Spirit, the *unitas caritatis*. Accordingly, this prayer accentuates that divine unity must be thought of primarily in terms of the life of the Holy Trinity. In treating Jesus' prayer, we are here beginning to enter into the economy; what follows thus anticipates Part Two of this study.

John 17:3: "This is eternal life, that they may know you, the only true God, and him whom you have sent, Jesus Christ."[303] In his treatement of this verse, Bonaventure attends to a potential problem. How should "God" be

---

[301] Significantly, Richard of St. Victor himself refers to the *condilectus*—the *completio Trinitatis*—as the "mutual coming together of *intimate benevolence* (*intime benivolentie*) and supreme harmony (*summe concordie*)." *De Trinitate*, 3.19 (ed. Ribaillier, 154).

[302] *Brev.*, 1.6.4 (5:215b).

[303] *In Ioann.*, 17.5 (6:468a).

taken? If it refers to the divine essence, then it seems superfluous to add "and him whom you have sent." If it is taken personally, though, then "God" would stand for the Father, and thus the Holy Spirit is altogether excluded from the verse. Bonaventure's response to the dilemma shows how the term can be taken either way. If taken essentially, then the "and him whom you have sent" refers to the human nature of Christ. If "God" refers personally to the Father, however, Bonaventure argues that the Spirit is *not* excluded. His reason: "because he is the union (*unio*) of the Father and the Son."[304] There is no Father and Son without the Spirit, their *unio*.

John 17:11: "Holy Father, preserve them in your name, which you have given to me."[305] For Bonaventure, Jesus here asks the Father to preserve his disciples "in the good (*in bono*): whence he says: 'that they may be one, just as we are,' namely in the unity of concord (*concordiae*) and of peace."[306] The pneumatological undertone of this citation is significant: both goodness and concord are appropriations of the Holy Spirit. Accordingly, Christ prays for his disciples to remain "in the good" *precisely because* he prays *ut sint unum, sicut et nos*. And what does this unity between the Father and Son look like? It is the Spirit: "union of the Father and the Son."[307] To enter into the mystery of the communion between the Father and Son is to enter into the mystery of the Spirit—ergo, *in bono*. It is the unity of concord (*unitas concordiae*): the Father and the Son are one in their fecundity of will, in their breathing forth mutual love, the Spirit who is their concord.

John 17:21: "That they may be one, as you Father are in me, and I in you."[308] According to Bonaventure:

> "That they may be one," through the conformity of love (*dilectionis*), "as you Father are in me, and I in you," that is, as we are one, "so that they may be one in us." … That unity takes place through the attachment of charity (*per adhaerentiam caritatis*). From 1 Cor. 6 [verse 17]: "He who adheres (*adhaeret*) to God is one spirit." But when they are united to one another in God, they are one in God.[309]

---

[304] *In Ioann.*, 17.11 (6:470a).
[305] *In Ioann.*, 17.20 (6:471a).
[306] *In Ioann.*, 17.20 (6:471a).
[307] See n304 above.
[308] *In Ioann.*, 17.36 (6:474b).
[309] *In Ioann.*, 17.36 (6:474b).

Bonaventure concludes that Jesus is petitioning here explicitly for the *unitas caritatis*.[310] That is the unity to which Jesus refers, the unity of love that is the Spirit: "as we are one." Elsewhere, Bonaventure says that when Christ prays *ut unum sint*, he is praying for the unity of the disciples "not of nature but of love through conformity to that highest unity (*summam unitatem*); but the members of Christ are united through mutual love (*amorem mutuum*): therefore in God there is the exemplar [= Holy Spirit] of this."[311]

John 17:23: "I in them, and you in me, so that they may be consummated into one."[312] To be consummated into one as Jesus prays is, so Bonaventure clarifies, to be "perfected in the unity of charity (*in unitate caritatis*)."[313] Jesus is not here referring to some abstract concept of essential unity, but rather to the personal reality of the Holy Spirit, the *nexus* of the Father and the Son. Jesus invites his disciples into the depths of divine unity: the very *nexus* of trinitarian life.

In his commentary on this verse, Bonaventure also refers to a quotation from Chrysostom, which says that there is no *discordia* in God's nature. Bonaventure uses this same term when he reflects on the second half of verse 23: "and the world may know that you have sent me, and that you have loved them, just as you have loved me."[314] How might the world know this? Bonaventure writes: "through the unity and concord, which it will see in them." *Unitatem et concordiam*: once again, Bonaventure utilizes pneumatological language to unpack the meaning of Christ's prayer. Christ asks the Father to love his disciples with the Spirit, that is, in the same way that the Father loves him.

John 17:26: "And I have made known to them your name."[315] This is the final verse of Christ's prayer. Bonaventure comments:

> Not only does he make it known through himself, but even more so (*amplius*) will he make it known through the Holy Spirit. Therefore he says: "And I will make it known," and this through the Holy Spirit, who is the love (*amor*) of the Father and the Son. Therefore he says: "So that

---

[310] *In Ioann.*, 17.37 (6:474b).
[311] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 3, fund. 1 (1:199a).
[312] *In Ioann.*, 17.39 (6:475a).
[313] *In Ioann.*, 17.39 (6:475a).
[314] *In Ioann.*, 17.39 (6:475a).
[315] *In Ioann.*, 17.45 (6:476b).

the love, by which (*qua*) you have loved me, may be in them," through the gift of the Holy Spirit. According to Romans 5 [verse 5]: "The love (*caritas*) of God has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit." "And I in them," because, according to 1 John 4: "Whoever abides in love (*caritate*), abides in God, and God [abides] in him"; and therefore it is also said there: "In this we have come to know that we abide in him, and he in us, because he has given to us of his Spirit." And whoever has the Spirit, has also the Son, and can be assured (*securus est*) that he shall have the Father.[316]

In this passage, Bonaventure's pneumatological explication of Christ's prayer emerges explicitly. A few aspects merit highlighting. First, the name of God will be made known not only through Christ, but "even more so" through the Holy Spirit, whom Christ sends. Second, when Christ prays that the love "by which" the Father loves him may be in his disciples, he is praying for the gift of charity that is the Holy Spirit. Divine charity is poured into our hearts "through the Holy Spirit" (Rom 5:5). Third, to have the Holy Spirit is to abide in God. Indeed, it is to become like the Holy Trinity.[317] Ultimately, the gift of the Holy Spirit, God's love poured into our hearts, realizes Christ's petition.[318]

3.4 *Trinitarian Unity as Perichoretic—Pneumatological—Unity*

To conclude this section, I want only to touch upon the similarity between Bonaventure's theology of *circumincessio* and the person of the Holy Spirit. Bonaventure's pneumatological vision and his theology of *circumincessio/perichoresis* intertwine. To think about divine unity in a pneumatological way is to think about divine unity in a perichoretic way.

For Bonaventure, the term *circumincessio* communicates the doctrine that "one [divine person] is in the other and vice versa." The term thus posits "distinction" and "unity."[319] As such, the lexicon of *circumincessio* corresponds to the pneumatological lexicon imbedded in the term *nexus*: *unio*

---

[316] *In Ioann.*, 17.45 (6:476b-477a).
[317] See *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 2, fund. 4 (1:197a).
[318] See also *Brev.*, 5.1.4 (5:253a), where Bonaventure remarks that whoever has the Spirit has God, which means entering into relation with the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.
[319] *I Sent.*, d. 19, p. 1, au., q. 4, resp. (1:349a). See also *Hex.*, 21.2 (5:432b).

consequens distinctionem.[320] As *nexus*, the Holy Spirit actualizes the fundamental framework of divine *circumincessio*. One might say that in the Spirit, *circumincessio* unfolds.

Furthermore, the Holy Spirit is God in God (*Deus in Deo*).[321] *Circumincessio* speaks to the way in which the divine persons are in one another. Once again, Bonaventure's pneumatology basically coalesces with the theology of *circumincessio*. Procession, as discussed above, is *ab alio in alium*: the Spirit is the breath of the Father proceeding into the Son and the breath of the Son proceeding into the Father. In this mutual breath they communicate *in Spiritu*, who is their mutual love.[322]

Lastly, in light of the preceeding subsection on Christ's High Priestly Prayer, when Christ prays that the Father may be in his disciples as the Father is in him, he is in effect praying for the gift of *circumincessio*. Christ prays that his disciples may experience the perichoretic life of divinity, "that they may be one just as we are." This petition is for the *unitas caritatis*—the Spirit. To enter into the divine intimacy of the Father and the Son—their being in one another, their perichoretic love—is to share in the Spirit, the *unitas caritatis*, the *nexus* of divine life.

4. Conclusion: The Finality of the Holy Spirit in the Holy Trinity

4.1 *The Spirit: Completion*

The Holy Trinity, undetermined by any extrinsic principle, is *ex se*, *secundum se*, and *propter se*. As *propter se*, Bonaventure understands intrinsic finality within the Holy Trinity: divine life has a *terminatio*, namely the Holy Spirit. The ordered life of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit is an intelligible circle culminating in the Spirit who thereby terminates the divine persons because he terminates divine order. The Trinity is *propter Spiritum sanctum*, inasmuch as the Holy Spirit terminates the order of divine

---

[320] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 2, ad 3 (1:203a)—see n181 above.
[321] *Dec. prae.*, 3.11 (5:517a)—see n118 above.
[322] See *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 2, fund. 3 (1:202a).

persons. In this, the circle of divine life is brought to completion in the *reductio* to the origin, the Father.

The transcendental metaphysics of the *Summa Halensis* shed light on this framework. In a word, the transcendental notion of goodness designates the fullness of actuality, the "indivision of act from potency," and thus the *complementum* of being. "The full realization or expression of being … only emerges at the end."[323] For the Halensis, such finality also enters into the metaphysical structure of the Trinity: the Holy Spirit is the *completio Trinitatis*.

Similary, the Holy Spirit is the *complementum* of the Holy Trinity. The Spirit thus manifests the complete actuality, *actus purus*, of divine life. Without the Holy Spirit, the Trinity is not fully in act because love is neither complete nor perfectly realized. The *actus purus* that is divine life originates in the Father; it is utterly expressed in the Son (*secundum se*); but without the Spirit it does not reach its completion or culmination. Thus does Bonaventure say that the Holy Spirit "terminates the divine persons." In the mystery of mutual love the first and the second person culminate and so the "eternal cycle" of divine life is perfect. The unoriginated origin—the Father—gives rise to plurality—in the Son—that finds its ultimate culmination in the *unitas amborum*: the Holy Spirit.

4.2 *The Spirit: God in God*

The distinction between the first and second person is perfected in the most perfect union, namely, the *unio caritatis* who is the Holy Spirit (*amor tendens in alium*). The fecundity of will of the Father and the Son thereby finds its *status*—its complete manifestation and realization—in the Spirit, which is why further emanations would be superfluous and thus contrary to the Divine Being's perfection.

The Spirit, ecstatic love coming out (*exit*) of the Father and the Son "just as love proceeds from the one loving,"[324] is love *in se* and hence renders

---

[323] Coolman, "Pneumatic Finality," 90—see n40 above.
[324] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 1, ad 3 (1:196b)—see n82 above.

utterly perfect the manifestation of love for another. The inevitable tension inherent in the expression of human love, which always inheres in the will of the subject loving, has no place in God. Divine life culminates in perfect and uninhibited manifestation of love for the other. The Spirit is not unlike the perfect love letter in God: the lover need not search for the right words to express his love, which is eternally and perfectly breathed forth.

For Bonaventure, procession is *ab alio et in alium*. This framework unveils the fullness of communion: the Father loves the Son and the Son loves the Father, and in this love (*nexus*), they are joined together (*coniunguntur*).[325] They share the same breath of love, in which breath they are connected: their mutual and eternal "I love you"—the Father stretching forth into the Son and the Son's ecstatic "yes" to the Father's breath of love.

Thus the Spirit *est Deus et in Deo*.[326] The Spirit is God in God. Divine life culminates in profound interrelationality and intersubjectivity: the three divine hypostases intertwine and interpenetrate. The eternal circle of the Triune God is complete in *Deus in Deo* as the love that flows (*effluens*) from the Father and into the Son (*effluxa*) flows also from the Son and into the Father in the Spirit (*refluxa*).[327]

4.3 *The Spirit: Nexus*

Critical to Bonaventure's pneumatology is the identity of the Holy Spirit as *nexus*. The distinction between Father and Son is incomplete without and thus presupposes and culminates in their spiritual *nexus*, unitive love. To echo Melone: "The mutual communication of the love that the two first persons realize in him [the Spirit] represents the fullness of trinitarian communion."[328]

As *nexus*, the Spirit is *unio consequens distinctionem*.[329] The Spirit realizes the final union of the emanative process that is rooted in the Father's *primitas*. To be *nexus* thus illuminates the Spirit as *ratio tertii* in the divine

---

[325] *I Sent.*, d. 11, au., q. 1, resp. (1:212a)—see n108 above.
[326] *Dec. prae.*, 3.11 (5:517a)—see n118 above.
[327] *Hex.*, 11.12 (5:382a)—see n126 above.
[328] Melone, "*Donum in quo omnia alia dona donantur*," 57.
[329] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 2, ad 3 (1:203a)—see n181 above.

life, and therefore the ultimate completion of the *ordo perfectus*: loving unity, the *completio trinitatis*.

4.4 *The Spirit: Divine Openness*

In his theology of gift, Bonaventure unveils that the Spirit is the hypostatic opening of God. Imbedded within his personal identity is *donabilitas*. The finality of divine life is heterologically open. This theology utterly departs from Aristotle's Prime Mover, Plotinus' One, as well as the religious traditions of the East. For Bonaventure, God is not enclosed but utterly open because God is love. The Holy Spirit brings to completion the eternal cycle of divine life, but does not lock the door behind him.

4.5 *The Spirit: effectus formalis*

Pater et Filius diligunt se Spiritu sancto. To explicate the sense of this phrase, Bonaventure interprets *diligere* notionally, which thus designates "the fecundity of the will (*voluntatis fecunditatem*) to produce a person."[330] This person is *amor nectens*.[331] For the Seraphic Doctor, *diligere* signifies the mode of emanation of the Holy Spirit, "the act of connecting or of harmonizing and spirating."[332] The Father and the Son are in total harmony and so spirate the Holy Spirit; in this spiration, they are connected together. Divine life culminates in perfect harmony and togetherness. The ultimate word of trinitarian theology, and thus of a Christian metaphysics, is not simply *being*, but rather *being-with* (inseparability) or *being-in* (mutual immanence).

The love—the Spirit—that proceeds from the Father and the Son is distinct from them and it realizes their act of loving. Love does not subsist formally in the Father and the Son, as it does in the case of human love, but is hypostatically personal. For the complete realization of the the Father and

---

[330] *I Sent.*, d. 32, a. 1, q. 1, resp. (1:558a)—see n239 above.
[331] *I Sent.*, d. 32, a. 1, q. 1, resp. (1:558a)—see n242 above, as well as n13 of Chapter Two above.
[332] *I Sent.*, d. 32, a. 1, q. 1, ad 1.2.3 (1:558b)—see n248 above.

the Son dyad something more than a mere dialogue is needed. Without the third person, the love between the Father and the Son would be only formal. In the Spirit, however, there is perfect manifestation: Love is hypostasis.

I think that from this we can draw a powerful conclusion. At its core, the human desire to love another *is* the desire for the Holy Spirit: the desire to breathe into the other a love that is not just formal, but personal. Love, in God, becomes truly interpersonal in that eternal act by which one person—*Amor*—proceeds *ab alio in alium*. The doctrine *Pater et Filius diligunt se Spiritu sancto* reveals that *love* "terminates the divine persons." In other words, the full manifestation of the complete actuality (*complementum*) of the Father and the Son is their—hypostatic—love for one another. Love is the *extremum* in whom the Father and the Son "are joined together (*coniunguntur*)."[333]

4.6 *The Spirit: Trinitarian Unity*

Bonaventure's pneumatology nuances the way in which to think about divine unity itself. In the final analysis, divine unity is nothing else if not trinitarian because the divine being is nothing else if not three divine persons. For the Seraphic Doctor, the *unitas caritatis* realized by the *condilectus* renders more perfect a mere unity of nature. The *unitas caritatis* illuminates the loving unity of the Holy Trinity. To meditate on the unity of the Divine Being is incomplete if it does not involve meditation on the mystery of the Holy Spirit.

Hence when Christ prays *ut unum sint*, he is praying for the gift of the Spirit so that his disciples may be one in the way that he is one with the Father, namely in the Spirit. A passage from Ratzinger's reflection on Augustine's pneumatology, which coheres well with Bonaventure's own vision, comes to mind:

> [The Holy Spirit's] particularity is being unity. … The mediation of Father and Son comes to full unity not when it is seen in a universal, ontic *consubstantialitas* but as *communio*. In other words, it is not derived from a universally metaphysical substance but from the person.

---

[333] *I Sent*., d. 11, au., q. 1, resp. (1:212a)—see n108 above.

According to the nature of God, it is intrinsically personal. … The Spirit is Person as unity, unity as Person.[334]

Bonaventure's pneumatology deepens a one-sided focus on the divine essence, and accentuates the perichoretic unity of trinitarian plurality. The *reditio completa* of divine life does not manifest its perfection in the absolute singularity of unity at the expense of alterity, but precisely in the heterocentric actuality of goodness. In a word, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit reveals that the primordial ground of all that is culminates not in an abstract concept of an absolute unity of nature per se, but rather in being-in-the-other—in the personal unity of charity, a unity into which Jesus Christ invites us.

---

[334] Ratzinger, "The Holy Spirit as Communio," 326.

PART TWO

Creation and the Finality of the Holy Spirit

The first part of this study focused on Bonaventure's trinitarian theology and, in particular, the finality of the Holy Spirit within the inner life of the Holy Trinity. This second part now turns to the created order. It focuses on how the finality of the Spirit shapes Bonaventure's theology of the created order and of salvation history broadly conceived. Chapter One of this second part explores the finality of the Spirit in Bonaventure's theology of creation and history (*carmen*/*decursum mundi*). This first chapter considers history from a panoramic bird's eye view. Chapter Two, then, enters into the narrative of salvation history and explores the Christian life in terms of the pneumatic finality of Christ's mission.

The Pneumatic Finality of Creation's Cosmic Song

This chapter begins the second part of this study. Its object, broadly speaking, is the finality of the Holy Spirit in Bonaventure's theology of the created order. By "created order," I intend more than just the "act" of creation in the beginning; I mean the whole created order, including time itself. In this regard, I focus on the narrative structure of history—what Bonaventure calls the *decursus mundi*. This *decursus* commences with creation and unfolds in the manner of a beautiful song (*carmen*). What thereby ensues after the creation of the world is not an unintelligible aimless chronicle of a temporally infinite, accidental series of successive events. Rather, as a *carmen*, there is overarching order to the *decursus*: a beginning, a middle, and an end. This ordered structure of history is thus ultimately a story. Creation "in the beginning" (Gen 1:1) constitutes the beginning of a story. This (hi)story therefore has a *mythos*, as well as a climatic central turning point and ultimate denouement, namely, the pneumatic finality of goodness: the *plenitudo bonitatis* of the Holy Spirit.

This chapter consists of three sections. The first section, propaedeutic in nature, offers some introductory remarks about Bonaventure's basic understanding of history and creation. By engaging with someone like Nietzsche, this section also accentuates the relevance of Bonaventure's thought. Section two, then, focuses especially on the *Breviloquium* and explicates the pneumatic finality of creation, especially in regards to history's *decursus*. This section is the most substantial of the present chapter. It explains the significance of the term *decursus mundi*; explicates the pneumatic finality of the *Breviloquium*'s structure; sheds light on the pneumatological nuance of the Third Commandment, Sabbath rest, and

charity; and concludes by unpacking the way in which the human journey manifests elements of pneumatic finality. The third section turns to the *Collationes in Hexaemeron* and attends to the dimension of the pneumatic finality in the theology of history therein developed.

Before all else, however, I offer three points of clarification to facilitate the reading of this chapter. First, it is important to stress that the aim of this chapter is not to disclose the role of the Holy Spirit at the creation of the world or throughout history. The aim is to disclose the pneumatic finality *of* history as a whole. This aim hinges on a certain bonaventurean insight, which will be unpacked in greater detail, namely, that integral wholeness characterizes the whole poetic shape (*carmen*) of the history—the *decursus*—of the world. For Bonaventure, a certain "perfection (*perfectio*) consists in the production of those things which flow through the times (*tempora decurrunt*) and succeed one another consequentially. A certain beauty and perfection of unity results from this ordered succession (*successionis ordinatione*)."[1]

Second, the term "pneumatic finality" must not be construed so as to displace the Father *from whom and to whom* all things are.[2] Key in this regard is Bonaventure's image of the intelligible circle, which I will discuss in the first section of this chapter.

Third, although the focus lies on the pneumatic finality of the *decursus* of all of creation—of the world and of time—it does *not* follow that eschatological reality is reserved for some future abstract tomorrow. The possibilities of the present moment exceed and are thus not limited by its own temporal confinement. As manifested especially in someone like St. Francis of Assisi, the fullness of Christian existence constitutes a kind of matrix out of which the eschatological "future" unfolds in the present. This point will be developed in more detail in the third section of this chapter.

---

[1] *II Sent.*, d. 15, a. 2, q. 3, resp. (2:387a). See also *II Sent.*, d. 15, a. 2, q. 1, ad 4.5 (2:383b); *In Eccl.* 3, a. 1 (6:32b); Balthasar, "Bonaventure," 313.

[2] See, e.g., *I Sent.*, d. 31, p. 2, dub. 7 (1:552a); *I Sent.*, d. 2, au., q. 2, ad 4 (1:54b); Woźniak, *Primitas et Plenitudo*, 208-209; Hayes, *Hidden Center*, 12-13; n90 in Part One, Chapter One above.

1. Introductory Remarks

1.1 *Bonaventure and Nietzsche (and Aristotle)*

"And do you know what 'the world' is to me?" Friedrich Nietzsche asks.[3] "This world: a monster of energy, without beginning, without end."[4] Thus begins his answer, which proceeds to describe what he calls his "*Dionysian* world … without goal."[5] This vision diverges resolutely from the Christian worldview rooted in creation. Indeed, Nietzsche explicitly distances himself from the notion of "creation":

> The world … is not something that becomes, not something that passes away. Or rather: it becomes, it passes away, but it has never begun to become and never ceased from passing away …. It lives on itself …. We need not worry for a moment about the hypothesis of a *created* world. The concept "create" is today completely indefinable, unrealizable; merely a word, a rudimentary survival from the ages of superstition.[6]

Accordingly, for Nietzsche, the breakdown of Christianity—the death of God—includes the collapse of its grand narrative of history: "Looking at nature as if it were proof of the goodness and governance of God; interpreting history in honor of some divine reason … that is *all over* now."[7] There is neither beginning nor end, and thus, no order to the whole.

Nietzsche's vision stands in stark contrast not only to the Christian tradition at large, but in a rather pronounced manner to the Seraphic Doctor's worldview. Indeed, in his own milieu, Bonaventure had emphatically rejected the aristotelian thesis that the world is eternal. For Bonaventure, the world—*and thus time itself*—is created *ex nihilo*. The world comes totally from God out of nothing (*esse ab aliquo ex nihilo*[8]), whose trinitarian life stamps the

---

[3] *The Will to Power*, trans. Walter Kaufmann and R. J. Hollingdale (New York: Vintage Books, 1968), 549.

[4] *The Will to Power*, 550.

[5] *The Will to Power*, 550 (emphasis in original). The reference to "Dionysian" is to the Greek god Dionysus—in contradistinction to Apollo who represents order.

[6] *The Will to Power*, 548 (emphasis in original).

[7] Nietzsche, *The Gay Science*, trans. Walter Kaufmann (New York: Vintage Books, 1974), 307

[8] "That [the world] has being after non-being (*esse post non-esse*) is proved as follows: everything, which has being totally (*totaliter*) from something else, is produced *ab illo ex*

whole fabric and architecture of created being. "The relation of the creature to the Creator is not accidental, but essential."[9]

Creation, then, is inseparable from Bonaventure's metaphysical outlook. To quote a relevant passage from the *Breviloquium*:

> Since it is necessary that the most perfect Principle, from whom comes forth the perfection of the universe (*perfectio universorum*), acts from itself, according to itself, and for the sake of itself (*a se et secundum se et propter se*)—because, in acting, it in no way needs something beyond itself—it is necessary that it have, with respect to any creature, the intention of a triple cause, namely efficient, exemplary, and final. It is necessary that every creature be related to the first cause (*comparari ad causam primam*) according to this triple relation. For every creature is constituted in being (*in esse*) by the efficient [cause] (*ab efficiente*), is conformed to the exemplar (*ad exemplar*), and is ordered to the end (*ordinatur ad finem*). And for this reason the creature is one, true, and good.[10]

In this passage, the ordered structure of created being comes to light, as does its—pneumatic—finality in goodness. The creature is constituted in its very being by the creating Trinity according to the Trinity's own intrinsic structure. As Coolman succinctly remarks: "Bonaventure offers … a thoroughly Trinitarian account of creation: the Trinity creates, does so 'trinitarianly,' and so creation reflects the Trinity."[11] God is *a se*, the creature is *ab efficiente*; God is *secundum se*, the creature is *ad exemplar*; God is *propter se*, the creature is *ad finem*. Significantly, efficiency, exemplarity, and finality, are appropriations of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit respectively. Accordingly, the creature is "one, true, and good," because oneness refers to the Father, truth to the Son, and goodness to the Holy Spirit.

Ordinatur ad finem: this statement conveys that an inner compass towards the pneumatic finality of goodness lies within the depths of created being. Created being is thus eschatological being: aimed toward the *plenitudo bonitatis* of creation's eschatological consummation.[12] This inner compass

---

nihilo; but the world has being totally from God: therefore the world [is] *ex nihilo*." *II Sent*., d. 1, p. 1, a. 1, q. 2, fund. 6 (2:22a).

[9] *Hex*., 4.8 (5:350a).

[10] *Brev*., 2.1.3 (5:219b). See also *Brev*., 2.1.1 (5:219a).

[11] Coolman, "Part II: 'On the Creation of the World,'" in *Bonaventure Revisited*, 141-167 at 142.

[12] See *Brev*., 7.1.2 (5:281a).

does not, therefore, point to a utopian ideal to be fabricated by human hands here.[13] Ideology is thus all too often a masked form of idolatry. The pole of attraction of this inner compass lies instead beyond the borders of creation. As God creates, he nestles into the ontological core of creation a compass that points to him. Creation itself thus entails the very overcoming of ultimate borders. An inkling of "passover" mystery thus accompanies the meaning of created being.[14] The world is enclosed neither in its own finitude nor in a Nietzschaen eternal recurrence. Rather, ordered to God, creation is open beyond itself to the uncreated Other.[15]

In marked contrast, then, to someone like Nietzsche, creation—including time itself—has a clear origin, exemplary truth, and is ordered to an ultimate end: *ab efficiente*, *ad exemplar*, *ad finem*. It is no wonder that Bonaventure would push back so vehemently against the Aristotelian thesis of the eternity of the world: an infinite series cannot be ordered.[16] The triple relation constitutive of created being would collapse:

- the negation of a beginning negates *ratio principiandi* (appropriation of the Father);
- the negation of the meaningful truth of being—i.e., exemplarity—negates *ratio exprimendi et exemplandi* (appropriation of the Son);
- the negation of an aim negates *ratio finiendi* (appropriation of the Holy Spirit).[17]

No intelligible order can emerge from an eternal world. Nietzsche was right about that.

It would be too great a digression to explicate in detail Bonaventure's stance in this important medieval debate or to evaluate his construal of Aristotle's philosophy.[18] Significant for the present chapter is a basic insight

---

[13] See *Brev.*, 2.4.5 (5:222a), 2 Cor 5:1.

[14] See *In Luc.*, 8.43 (7:201a): this world is a "certain *transitus*."

[15] In this respect, sin comes to light as the denial of self-transcendence, the attempt to enclose oneself in oneself: hence *incurvatus*—see *Itin.*, 1.7 (5:297b-298a). Sin rebels against life *propter Deum*, and chooses instead to construct oneself *propter se*—see *Brev.*, 3.1.3 (5:231ab).

[16] See *II Sent.*, d. 1, p. 1, a. 1, q. 2, fund. 2 (2:21a); *I Sent.*, d. 43, au., q. 3, fund. 5 (1:772a); Ratzinger, *Theology of History*, 138-140.

[17] See *Brev.*, 1.6.3 (5:215ab).

[18] There is ample literature on this subject. See, for example, Bernardino Bonansea, "The Question of an Eternal World in the Teaching of St. Bonaventure," *Franciscan Studies* 34 (1974), 7-33; Stephan Baldner, "St. Bonaventure on the Temporal Beginning of the World," *New Scholasticism* 63 (1989): 206-228; Peter van Veldhuijsen, "The Question on

fundamental to Bonaventure's vision, which Ratzinger expresses eloquently: "the whole of history develops in one unbroken line of meaning."[19] Such a perspective cannot coherently apply to a beginningless and endless world— "a monster of energy." The aristotelian thesis results in a metaphysics that conflicts with Christianity in its utter negation of a theology of creation. "This is *our* whole metaphysics," declares the Seraphic Doctor,

> regarding emanation [→ efficient causality → *ratio principiandi*], exemplarity [→ exemplar causality → *ratio exemplandi*], and consummation [→ final causality → *ratio finiendi*].[20]

Herein lies the fundamental structure of the grand created *carmen*.[21] In the background of this grand *carmen* lies Bonaventure's metaphysical notion of the circle: the end returns to the beginning.[22]

In contrast to "one unbroken line of meaning," for Aristotle "history takes place on the level of accidentally ordered causes and pertains to the realm of accidental infinity. Consequently, it is not really a part of the genuinely ordered cosmos of causes; for this causality lies in a different direction. … History is the realm of chance."[23] For his part, Nietzsche speaks of the "great dice game of existence."[24] In effect, Bonaventure intuited that if

---

the Possibility of an Eternally Created World: Bonaventura and Thomas Aquinas," in *The Eternity of the World: In the Thought of Thomas Aquinas and his Contemporaries*, ed. J.B.M. Wissink (Leiden: Brill, 1990), 20-38; Benjamin Brown, "Bonaventure on the Impossibility of a Beginningless World: Why the Traversal Argument Works," *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 79 (2005): 389-409.

[19] Ratzinger, *Theology of History*, 8. In addition to Ratzinger's study, which has very much informed my own position regarding Bonaventure's theology of history, see also Bernard McGinn, "The Significance of Bonaventure's Theology of History," *The Journal of Religion* 58 Suppl. (1978): 64-81; Alessandro Ghisalberti, "La concezione della storia in san Bonaventura," *Doctor Seraphicus* 30 (1983): 81-94; Kevin Hughes, "Eschatological Union: The Mystical Dimension of History in Joachim of Fiore, Bonaventure, and Peter Olivi," *Collectanea Francescana* 72 (2002): 105-143; Andrea Di Maio, "Il problema della storia in Bonaventura," *Doctor Seraphicus* 63 (2015): 45-75; Aurelio Rizzacasa, "I sette giorni della creazione e le sette epoche della storia nelle *Collationes in Hexaëmeron* di san Bonaventura," *Doctor Seraphicus* 63 (2015): 77-92; Joseph Milne, "Saint Bonaventure and the Divine Order of Creation," *Medieval Mystical Theology* 30 (2021): 17-36. This list, as well as the list in n18 above, are by no means exhaustive.

[20] *Hex.*, 1.17 (5:332b), emphasis mine.

[21] Alexander Schaefer refers to this threefold metaphysical structure as "the great drama of creation." See his "The Position and Function of Man in the Created World According to Saint Bonaventure [Part 1]," *Franciscan Studies* (1960) 20: 261-316 at 262. Bonaventure's term, however, which I will utilize, is poem/song (*carmen*).

[22] See Section 1.2 below.

[23] Ratzinger, *Theology of History*, 140.

[24] Nietzsche, *The Will to Power*, 549.

the doctrine of creation shrivels, then the alternative *Dionysian* vision of eternal "aimlessness"[25] will be on the prowl. At the risk of exaggeration, Bonaventure beheld, within the principles behind an Aristotelian vision of history, nietzschean conclusions utterly incompatible with Christian faith.

For Bonaventure, that is, history is not an eternal "stage upon which persons come and go."[26] Rather, the *decursus* of time as created entity is eschatological in character. Consequently, a convergence results: history is eschatological just like created being is eschatological (= *ordinatur ad finem*). "Salvation history," so observes Aurelio Rizzacasa, "in the bonaventurean context, is not separable from metaphysics."[27] This convergence should not surprise, given that time itself is created and thus stamped by God's triple causality. It is ordered. A fitting passage from Gilson comes to mind:

> All order … starts from a beginning, passes through a middle point and reaches an end [i.e., emanation, exemplarity, consummation]. If there is no first term there is no order; now if the duration of the world and therefore the revolutions of the stars had no beginning, their series would have had no first term and they would possess no order …. In St. Bonaventure's Christian universe there is, in reality, no place for Aristotelian accident: his thought shrinks from supposing a series of causes accidentally ordered, that is to say without order, without law and with its terms following one another at random. Divine Providence must penetrate the universe down to its smallest details …. The root of the matter is that St. Bonaventure's Christian universe differs from the pagan universe of Aristotle in that it has a history.[28]

Creation implies beginning, and order implies that this beginning has an end. Bonaventure's theology of order thereby interprets time within the neoplatonic framework of an *egressus* and a *regressus*. Time itself is not abstracted from this metaphysical structure. Accordingly, time is more than the mere measure of duration. As Bonaventure explicitly remarks, time is not only the "mensuram durationis, sed etiam egressionis."[29] *Egressio*, moreover,

---

[25] Nietzsche, *The Will to Power*, 546.

[26] Milne, "Saint Bonaventure and the Divine Order of Creation," 23.

[27] Rizzacasa, "I sette giorni della creazione," 85.

[28] Gilson, *The Philosophy of St. Bonaventure*, trans. DomIlltyd Trethowan and F. J. Sheed (London: Sheed & Ward, 1940), 191-192; see Ratzinger, *Theology of History*, 142.

[29] *II Sent.*, d. 2, p. 1, a. 2, q. 3, resp. (2:68a).

bespeaks creation: "Creatura egreditur a Creatore."[30] Ratzinger offers a fine analysis of Bonaventure's position:

> It [time] is not only the measure of inner-worldly processes; but it is above all the "time of creation [= *egressionis*]," which measures the ordered emergence of things from the creative power of God. In as far as it is ordered to *egressio*, it is integrated right from the start into the great Bonaventurean vision of the world; for wherever we speak of *egressio*, we affirm a *regressio* together with it.[31]

Hence, time is "right from the start … saving time."[32] History is the chronicle of creation's pilgrimage toward eschatological glory: the finality of goodness.

1.2 *The Dynamism of Being: The Metaphysics of the Circle*

Ratzinger's reference to *egressio* and *regressio* recalls the fundamental metaphysical structure of creation as *carmen*. This *egressio* and *regressio* characterizes the circular dynamic constitutive of created being. The whole world is ultimately meant to return to its source in God in the manner of an

---

[30] *Hex.*, 12.3 (5:385a).

[31] Ratzinger, *Theology of History*, 141. See also Ghisalberti, "La concezione della storia," 82-84. For the sake of accuracy, it is important to note that Bonaventure does not utterly reject Aristotle's take on time. On the contrary, he uses Aristotle's definition. Yet, as Ghisalberti has observed, Bonaventure says that Aristotle's notion of time as the measure of motion is a *coarctata acceptio*—see *II Sent.*, d. 2, p. 1, a. 2, q. 2, resp. (2:65a). To flesh out what Bonaventure means by this, Ghisalberti takes into consideration *II Sent.*, d. 1, p. 1, a. 2, q. 2, ad 4 (2:23b). Therein, Bonaventure distinguishes between two ways of speaking about time, i.e., *secundum essentiam* or *secundum esse*: "If according to essence (*essentiam*), then the *nunc* is the whole essence of time, and that begins with the moveable thing (*re mobili*), not in another *nunc*, but in itself, because *status* is in the first, whence it does not have another measure. If according to being (*esse*), then it begins with the motion of change (*motu variationis*), namely it begins not with creation, but rather through the change of the changeables themselves (*per ipsorum mutabilium mutationem*), especially of the first mover (*maxime primi mobilis*)." The problem with Aristotle's definition, as Ghisalberti sees it, is that it insists too heavily on the *esse* of time: "sulla varietà delle durate misurate in base al moto regolare del primo mobile" (84). He continues: "per Aristotele una temporalità ancorata al primo mobile equivale a perpetuità, equivale a circolarità senza inizio e senza fine. Le realtà materiali, misurate dal primo mobile, sono collocate su una linea di successione perpetua …; lo spostamento del fondamento della temporalità da un *nunc* fisico a un *nunc* ideale [= time *secundum esse* and time *secundum essentiam*], quello dell'inizio della creazione, colloca invece la storia su una linea progressiva a partire da un inizio ben preciso, l'istante in cui Dio ha dato origine al molteplice, e la orienta verso un fine realmente conclusivo, il ritorno in Dio." Simply put, Aristotle's notion is too restricted because it cannot account for the "time of creation" (*egressionis*), as Ratzinger calls it. It thereby eliminates any notion of an intrinsic end ("un fine realmente conclusivo").

[32] Ratzinger, *Theology of History*, 142.

intelligible circle.[33] "Emanation," writes Hayes, "is simultaneously a movement toward the return or reduction of creation to God."[34] The world is a "certain transitus … *ex hoc mundo ad Patrem*."[35]

For creation's return to its origin, the position of the human person is fundamental.[36] Yet, the "return" of the human person ultimately rests on the centrality and mediation of the Word Incarnate.[37] Hence, the *reductio* belongs in a particular way to the mission of the Son, insofar as Christ's centrality (*medium*) is a mediating center (*mediator*).

Nonetheless, the ultimate *reductio ad Patrem*[38] does not belong exclusively to Christ's mission: both the Son and the Spirit are *reducentes ad Deum*.[39] To echo Hayes once more: "The origin of all from the Father through the Son and the Spirit, and the return of all to the Father through the Son and the Spirit constitutes the 'intelligible circle' of created existence which, in its own way, reflects the 'intelligible circle' that is the life of God."[40]

As the mediating center between God and man, Christ is the sure *foundation* of the *reductio*. Its *perfection*, though, lies in the Spirit. The "completion (*complementum*)" of the intelligible circle pertains to the pneumatological mystery of grace, and thus in a particular way to the Spirit—*complementum* of the Trinity.[41] Bonaventure says that Christ "leads us to the Father (*nos reducit ad Patrem*) through the gift and *nexum* of the Holy Spirit."[42] Hellmann thus fittingly avers that "the very *power of the return* (*reductio*) to the Father is the Spirit. … The *reductio ad Patrem* is a unity of love. … This means Christ gives all humans that same Spirit who unites Him

---

[33] See *Brev.*, 2.4.3 (5:221b); *Myst. Trin.*, q. 3, a. 1, resp. (5:70ab), q. 7, a. 1, resp. (5:108a), q. 8, ad 7 (5:115b).

[34] Hayes, *Hidden Center*, 13.

[35] *In Luc.*, 8.43 (7:201a).

[36] See Section 2.4.1 below.

[37] See *Red. art.* 23 (5:324a); *I Sent.*, d. 31, p. 2, dub. 7 (1:552a); *Itin.*, prol. 3 (5:295b). Cf. Gerken, *Theologie des Wortes*, 139-151.

[38] *Hex.* 1.17 (5:332a).

[39] *I Sent.*, d. 27, p. 2, au., q. 2, ad 5 (1:486b).

[40] Hayes, "Introduction," 101.

[41] See *Brev.*, 5.1.6 (5:253a); Fehlner, *The Role of Charity*, 122; Schaefer, "The Position and Function of Man [Part 1]," 270. For the Holy Spirit as *complementum*, see *Hex.*, 1.12 (5:331b) and 21.4 (5:432a).

[42] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 4, a. 2, fund. 10 (5:85b). See Guardini, *Die Lehre des heil. Bonaventura von der Erlösung* (Düsseldorf: L. Schwann – Druckerei U. Verlag, 1921), 59-60.

to the Father."[43] He eventually concludes: "the *reducere* of creation is completed in the same *uno nexu* of the Spirit uniting the Father and Son."[44]

The human person's existential return to the Father lies in the Spirit insofar as the Spirit constitutes the *point of return* to the Father. Therein lies the basic meaning of "pneumatic finality" when considered from a more existential perspective. It is an ablative finality, so to speak.[45] In this way, moreover, it corresponds well to the life of the Trinity *ad intra*, in which—as discussed in the final chapter of Part 1 of this study—the Son returns to the Father in the breath of love that is the procession of the Spirit (*ab alio in alium*). In a trenchant passage, Balthasar states:

> The divine process finds its perfected end, not in the Son, but in the Spirit. This dialectic runs through Bonaventure's whole system, for while on the one hand he describes the Word from many points of view as the centre of all things, at the same time he describes him as the centre which leads back to the Father (*and that means in the spiration of the Spirit*), and which surpasses itself, as this happens in love in the form of *affectus*, *excessus* and *unio* in the silence of understanding.[46]

To grasp correctly what is meant by "pneumatic finality," Bonaventure's conception of the circle is key. It illuminates the sense of the finality of the Spirit both in terms of the return of human person and of the grand *decursus mundi*. Ultimate finality returns to primordial origin.

2. The *Breviloquium*: *Decursus* of the Cosmic Song

In the prologue to the *Breviloquium*, Bonaventure affirms that Scripture describes the course of the world (*decursus mundi*) from its inception to the day of judgment.[47] Scripture, in other words, tells a certain story: the story "of the world and of time." This story commences "in the beginning" of Genesis and concludes in the Book of Revelation: from the "beginning of the world and of time … to the end of the world and of time."[48] Its course runs

---

[43] Hellmann, *Divine and Created Order*, 80 (emphasis mine).
[44] Hellmann, *Divine and Created Order*, 182. See also n194 below.
[45] See, e.g., *I Sent*., d. 27, p. 2, au., q. 2, ad 5 (1:486b).
[46] Balthasar, "Bonaventure," 290-291 (emphasis mine).
[47] I discuss this notion of *decursus* in Section 2.1 below.
[48] *Brev*., prol. 2.1 (5:203b).

through three laws—the law of nature, the written law, and the law of grace—which consists of seven ages—from Adam to Noah, from Noah to Abraham, and so forth all the way to Christ.[49] Indeed, drawing from the Augustinian tradition, Bonaventure understands the whole of salvation history, and thus the whole *decursus mundi*, as seminally enfolded within the creation story of Genesis. "God's seven-day act of creation," writes Coolman, "sets the stage for and prefigures the seven-stage drama of salvation history."[50] The story thus proceeds not haphazardly, but according to a well divided plot divinely authored.

It is not essential here to detail the way in which Genesis 1 recounts the seven ages of the world. Relevant, however, is the principle behind such a structural account of history: inner directionality (*directio in finem*), i.e. the "inner compass" I spoke of above, lies at the heart of creation.[51] Creation is being *en route*. Significantly in this regard, Bonaventure argues that, while God could have created the human person in beatitude and the universe itself in its perfection as it will be after final judgment, he chose not to do so: "he preferred, however, to preserve (*servare*) order not only in the existence of the world, but also in its *decursu*, because then his wisdom (*sapientia*) is more efficaciously (*efficacius*) manifested."[52] Being ordered toward an end is essential to created being's constitution.[53] "According to the *decursum universi*, it is necessary that a thing (*res*) is first at a distance from its end (*longe a fine*), and afterwards draw near (*appropinquet*)."[54] The universe, according to the logic of *decursus*, is *en route* toward a final goal. Creation is

---

[49] To be precise, Bonaventure offers two different, albeit very similar, schemata of the seven ages; see *Brev.*, prol. 2.1-2 (5:203b-204a).

[50] Coolman, "Part II: 'On the Creation of the World,'" 149. See also *Brev.*, prol. 2.2 (5:204a) and 2.2.7 (5:220ab). The allegorical interpretation of Genesis 1 is the *decursus mundi*—see *II Sent.*, d. 12, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (2:297a). *Nota bene*: Earlier I remarked that I prefer the bonaventurean term *carmen*. Coolman here uses "drama." I am not totally opposed to that term, but it is a different literary genre. The term seems appropriate, however, when we consider the horror and entrance of sin.

[51] *I Sent.*, d. 40, a. 1, q. 2, ad 1 (1:705b); see also *I Sent.*, d. 47, au., q. 3, resp. (1:844ab).

[52] *II Sent.*, d. 12, a. 1, q. 2, fund. 3 (2:296a). See Di Maio, "Il problema della storia," 71.

[53] "For since [God] is the highest good, he is not able to make something unless it be good, and thus he is only able to make something that is ordered to him." *I Sent.*, d. 43, au., q. 3, resp. (1:772a). See also Schaefer, "The Position and Function of Man [Part 1]," 288.

[54] *I Sent.*, d. 44, a. 1, q. 3, ad 3 (1:786b). Di Maio, "Il problema della storia," 50: "Dunque, sebbene essere *in patria* sia meglio che essere *in via*, tuttavia è meglio che alla *patria* arriviamo tramite la *via*! Questo dà il senso della convenienza della realizzazione 'storica' della salvezza."

not just a doctrine about origins. It is also about the destination. So what is the destination?

The simple answer is: God. My aim, however, is to explicate the specifically pneumatological nuance of this answer. Admittedly, at first glance, the pneumatological component is not so obvious. That is, according to the seven-age schema of the *Breviloquium*'s prologue, "the whole of time … is consummated in the end of the sixth age."[55] In this schema, the consummation of creation would thereby lie in the mystery of Christ: the sixth age is the birth of Christ, and the seventh, which "runs with the sixth (*decurrit cum sexta*)," is "the rest of souls (*quies animarum*)."[56] This traditional interpretation of Christ as history's consummation does not, however, take into account the whole picture of Bonaventure's project.

A more attentive reading of the *Breviloquium* would reveal that history's consummation betrays a more pneumatological nuance. Indeed, the *Breviloquium* is unambiguously Christo-*centric*. It thus communicates a more pronounced christic centrality, not finality, of history. In this way, the *Breviloquium* anticipates the Christocentric theology of history championed in the *Hexaemeron*. As Ratzinger had already astutely observed, while Bonaventure utilizes "the doctrine of the six ages" in the *Breviloquium*, "it is given a new tone which significantly comes entirely from Bonaventure's own world of thought."[57]

In what follows, I flesh out Ratzinger's correct, yet underdeveloped, observation. The rest of this section thus shows that a more comprehensive view of the *Breviloquium*'s structure, as well as attention to the theological significance of the Sabbath *quies animarum* and the pneumatic finality of the human person, proffer a more nuanced interpretation of history's consummation. I will attend to each of these three points in subsections 2.2-2.4 below. Beforehand, however, I first turn to Bonaventure's conclusion of the schema of the seven ages as presented in the prologue of the

---

[55] *Brev.*, prol. 2.2 (5:204a).
[56] *Brev.*, prol. 2.1-2 (5:203b-204b).
[57] Ratzinger, *Theology of History*, 109-110. Ratzinger argues that the "fullness of time" in the *Breviloquium* is taken to mean the "center of time." I am in substantial agreement with Ratzinger's intuition on this point, though the relevant text in question (*Brev*. 4.4) is, to be fair, not so clear cut. See also my comments at n82 below.

Breviloquium. Doing so will shed light on the theological significance of the term *decursus mundi*, the importance of which has already emerged.

2.1 *Decursus mundi*

After showing how the seven days of creation describe the whole *decursus mundi*, Bonaventure concludes:

> Therefore, the whole world is described by Scripture to proceed—in a most orderly course (*ordinatissimo decursu*)—from beginning to end in the manner of a most beautiful ordered song (*pulcherrimi carminis ordinati*). [In this song] one is able to observe (*speculari*) according to the course of time (*decursum temporis*) the variety, multiplicity, and fairness, the order, rectitude, and beauty of the many divine judgments that proceed from the wisdom of God governing the world (*a sapientia Dei gubernante mundum*). Just as no one is able to see the beauty of a song, unless one's gaze is lifted over the composition as a whole (*feratur super totum versum*), so no one sees the beauty of the order and rule (*regiminis*) of the universe unless one observes it as a whole. And because no human is so old so as to see the whole by the eye of the body, nor can any human foresee the future, the Holy Spirit has provided us with the book of Holy Scripture, whose length corresponds to the course of the rule of the universe (*decursui regiminis universi*).[58]

In this passage, God emerges as a masterful conductor. God wisely governs and guides the musicality of creation—a most beautiful song.[59] The world is far from a "monster of energy."

The above citation also reveals the inner significance of history as *decursus*. In an insightful study, Andrea Di Maio has shown that this term, in the way Bonaventure uses it, designates history not as a mere "re-telling of facts," but rather "as a progression (*decorso*) of human events and, at the same time, as the history of salvation."[60] In other words, history as *decursus* is far from accidental: it is intelligible and meaningful.[61] Enfolded within the whole

---

[58] *Brev.*, prol. 2.4 (5:204b).

[59] The image of *carmen* comes ultimately from Augustine. See, e.g., *De civitate Dei* 11.18.

[60] Di Maio, "Il problema della storia," 46. While the Italian word *decorso*, which comes from the Latin *decursus*, can be translated simply as "course," it also connotes "progression" or "development" through the passing of time.

[61] See Schaefer, "The Position and Function of Man [Part 1]," 306. I do not want to deny the horrors of history; obviously, *decursus* does not mean that tomorrow necessarily implies less war and more love than today. The beauty and order of the *decursus* lies in its

of history lies this mystical *decursus*. Indeed, this vision of history is all-encompassing: "from beginning to end."[62] Nothing escapes the God who creates out of nothing.

As the passage above clarifies, the subject of that which *decurrit* is "the whole world." "The whole dynamic of created reality is thus a pilgrimage toward a goal."[63] It is not, therefore, just the human person who has a religious vocation or dimension. All of reality possesses a deeply spiritual core—a conviction that the life and prayer of St. Francis manifested.[64] Indeed Bonaventure affirms not only that there is a *decursus* of the *maior mundus*, but that it corresponds to the *decursus* of the *minor mundus*—the human person.[65] The *itinerarium* of the human person, "the poor one in the desert,"[66] to heavenly beatitude thus illuminates the mystical thrust and destination of created being as a whole.[67] Toward glory all things tend as to their ultimate and complete end.[68]

I conclude this subsection with a passage from Bonaventure's *Commentarius in Librum Sententiarum*. It reveals the trinitarian design of the *decursus* of the cosmic song and thereby conveys the pneumatic finality of goodness to which the whole of creation is ordered. The context of this

---

integral structure and wholeness. See *II Sent.*, d. 36, a. 2, q. 1, resp. (2:848b-849a); *I Sent.*, d. 44, a. 1, q. 3, ad 3 (1:786b); Balthasar, "Bonaventure," 313-314.

[62] "It is essential for Scripture to provide this all-encompassing view of time because … without knowledge of the whole, the individual events of history can seem disparate and random. From the perspective of the course of time, discrete events are seen as part of an orderly and divinely-ordained plain. Thus the length of Scripture testifies to divine wisdom and providence at work within human history." Catherine Levri, "The Prologue to the *Breviloquium*," in *Bonaventure Revisited*, 73-95 at 88.

[63] Di Maio, "Il problema della storia," 48.

[64] As the *Canticle of Creatures* (*FAED* 1:113-114) clearly evinces. For Bonaventure, Francis does not hesitate to remind animals to praise God: see, e.g., Francis' interaction with *soror cicada* at *LMj.*, 8.9 (8:528b-529a). The personality of Francis even attests to the manner in which the lesser world encapsulates the greater world: animals are, as it were, drawn to him and participate in his own rhythm of prayer. See, e.g., *LMj.*, 8.10 (5:529a). Interestingly, Bonaventure (*LMj.*, 9.1 [8:530a]) notes that Francis "perceived [in creatures] the celestial choir in the harmony (*in consonantia*) of the powers and acts given to them by God." Francis prays his *Canticle*, one might say, because he intuited the *optimas consonantias* of the *carmen* (see n69 below).

[65] *Brev.*, prol. 2.2 (5:204a). See also *Itin.*, 1.5 (5:297b); James McEvoy, "Microcosm and Macrocosm in the Writings of St. Bonaventure," in *S. Bonaventura 1274-1974*, vol. 2, *Studia De Vita, Mente, Fontibus et Operibus Sancti Bonaventurae*, ed. Jacques Guy Bourgerol (Grottaferrata: Collegio S. Bonaventura, 1974), 309-343.

[66] *Itin.* (5:296).

[67] See Section 2.4 below.

[68] See *Brev.*, 7.4.7 (5:283b).

passage is Bonaventure's discussion of the order of the world; in brief, he thinks God has ordered the world optimally toward its end.

> Things are ordered optimally (*optime*) to the end (*in finem*), preserving the order of the universe, because the universe is like a most beautiful song (*pulcherrimum carmen*), which *decurrit* according to the best harmonies of notes (*secundum optimas consonantias*), with some parts succeeding others, until things are perfectly ordered to the end (*perfecte ordinentur in finem*). Whence, just as power (*potentia*) is manifested in the production of things, but in reference or in order to non-being (*non-ens*) the highest power, creating *ex nihilo*, is shown; so the order of things in the universe in itself shows wisdom (*sapientiam*), and the order to the end [shows] goodness (*bonitatem*), but the highest wisdom and the highest goodness is shown in the relation of one to the other, because nothing is able to disorder (*deordinare*) this order.[69]

The order of the cosmic song, which flows (*decurrit*) from the beginning of the world and of time to the end, reveals the power, wisdom, and goodness of God. These are appropriations of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. The *carmen* itself thereby constitutes a "vestige" of the Holy Trinity.[70] Structurally, the *carmen* is trinitarian. These appropriations unveil the structure of the cosmic, all-encompassing *decursus* from its origin to its end as trinitarian.

Furthermore, the above passage makes reference to two orders, which Bonaventure had introduced earlier in his response. In brief, and without veering into too great a digression, he identifies an order of things within the universe (*ordo partium in toto*) and an order of things in the universe toward their end (*ordo partium in finem*). The first order manifests God's wisdom, and the second God's goodness.[71] These two orders are interrelated: the order of things in the universe—which "regards wisdom"—is *propter ordinationem ad finem*. The order of wisdom, an appropriation of the Son, is therefore for the sake of the order of goodness, an appropriation of the Spirit.[72] Thus, the

---

[69] *I Sent.*, d. 44, a. 1, q. 3, resp. (1:786b).

[70] For Bonaventure, creatures as vestiges lead to a knowledge of God in terms of what is common as appropriated (*in cognitionem communium, ut appropriata*). Vestiges do not, however, lead to a knowledge of the properties as proper to the particular persons. See *I Sent.*, d. 3, p. 1, au., q. 2 (1:73b); Luigi Iammarrone, "Imago – Vestigium," 482-491.

[71] *I Sent.*, d. 44, a. 1, q. 3, resp. (1:786a). See Schaefer, "The Position and Function of Man [Part 1]," 273-274.

[72] See also *Lign. vit.*, 1.1 (8:71a), wherein Bonaventure accentuates that the Son, "sapientia Generantis," governs and orders all things.

decursus of the world—governed by God's wisdom—betrays pneumatic finality in its ordination toward goodness.

The careful reader may now observe pneumatic finality enfolded also within the passage with which this subsection began.[73] Therein, Bonaventure had spoken of God's wisdom and the rule (*regimen*) of the universe. What is the goal of this rule? To where does God's governing wisdom lead? The answer lies in the final stretch of the *Breviloquium*: the fullness of goodness (*plenitudo bonitatis*).[74] *Regere* anticipates *consummare*.[75] Creation is ordered toward the consummation of the "fullness of goodness" of the Spirit.

2.2 *Pneumatic Finality of the Breviloquium's Structure*

2.2.1 A Text With (At Least) Two Structures

Near the end of the *Breviloquium*'s prologue, Bonaventure lays out the structure of the text as a whole. He says that the Scriptures treat the "whole universe (*toto universo*)": the *primum*, the *decursum intermedium*, and the *ultimum*.[76] This ordered triad intimates the fundamental structure of the *Breviloquium* as both trinitarian and historical. History is trinitarian in its unfoldment; this unfoldment, in turn, conveys history's trinitarian source and structure. For the sake of coherency, and to show the systematic character of Bonaventure's thought hitherto explored, the following schema emerges:

---

[73] See n58 above.

[74] *Brev.*, 7.1.2 (5:281a).

[75] See my comments at Section 2.2.3 below.

[76] *Brev.*, prol. 6.7 (5:208a). See also *Itin.*, 1.12 (5:298b), where Bonaventure utilizes a similar triad: *originem*, *decursum*, and *terminum*. He goes on: "For by faith we believe that the world was fashioned (*aptata esse*) by the Word of life; by faith we believe that the time of the three laws, namely of nature, of Scripture, and of grace succeed one another and flow in a most orderly way (*ordinatissime decurrisse*); by faith we believe, that the world is to be completed (*terminandum esse*) at the final judgment. One considers (*advertentes*) power of the highest principle in the first [→ the Father in the origin], providence of the highest principle in the second [→ the Son in the course], and justice of the highest principle in the third [→ the Holy Spirit in the completion]."

Breviloquium's Fundamental Triadic Structure	Appropriation	Creation is constituted in being	Divine Person
primum	*potentia*	*ab efficiente* (God creates *a se*)	The Father
decursus intermedium	*sapientia* (governance)	*ad exemplar* (God creates *secundum se*)	The Son
ultimum	*bonitas*	*ad finem* (God creates *propter se*)	The Holy Spirit

Insofar as the *Breviloquium*'s structure is trinitarian, it is also therefore Christocentric. This Christocentrism is implied earlier in the prologue itself, wherein Bonaventure had averred that the wisdom of God governs the *decursus*.[77] The *decursus* manifests wisdom.[78] Implictly, then, the Son emerges already in the prologue of the text as the governing center that leads towards the final *ultimum*.

The center of the fundamental triadic structure coordinates with the explicit textual center of the *Breviloquium*'s division into seven thematic parts. That is, Part 4 "On the Incarnation of the Word" is halfway to the *ultimum*, namely, Part 7 of the text: the *plenitudo bonitatis* of eschatological completion. He, to whom is appropriated wisdom and thus the governance of the *decursus* itself, becomes incarnate and enters into that very *decursus* precisely at its center. Christ holds the entire *decursus* together; the *medium* as *mediator* mediates origin and destination thereby definitively orienting creation's itinerary to the *plenitudo bonitatis* of the Spirit—a climax anticipated already in the pentecostal culmination of Christ's own mission in Part 4. In sum, the triadic structure ultimately discloses not only Christic centrality but also the pneumatic finality of goodness. The center fulcrum mediates return to the Father through the Spirit: "per ardentissimam caritatem," "'ut sint unum, sicut et nos' … per vinculum caritatis."[79]

This trinitarian triadic structure constitutes what I will call the *Breviloquium*'s *fundamental or meta-narrative structure*. It is the *substrate* of the text's division into seven parts.[80] As Goff has also argued:

---

[77] See *Brev.*, prol. 2.4 (5:204b)—n58 above. See also *Brev.*, 1.2.4 (5:211a).
[78] See n69 and n72 above.
[79] *Brev.*, 5.6.6 (5:259b) and 5.8.4 (5:262a).
[80] See Goff, "Part I: 'On the Trinity of God,'" 99.

[an] overall Trinitarian dynamic … governs the order of the *Breviloquium* as a whole. … The order of the *Breviloquium*'s seven parts reveals how on a general level the inner Trinitarian dynamism of personal origination, exemplification, and return also conditions the structure and order of created reality and salvation history. … This Trinitarian structure encompasses and orders the course of history as centered upon the Person of the Incarnate Word, Jesus Christ, as he provides the remedy for sin and the fall, as well as initiates the return of creation … to the Father through his mediation in and with the graces of the Holy Spirit and the sacramental medicines.[81]

Shortly, I will discuss the sevenfold division in greater detail. Important at this point is that the trinitarian meta-narrative structure itself nuances the way to interpret the prologue's account of the correspondence between the days of creation and the ages of the world. As mentioned above, the prologue's schema located consummation at the end of the sixth age. This Augustinian schema of history, however, needs to be calibrated to fit Bonaventure's more fundamental trinitarian vision that governs the thematic sevenfold division of the *Breviloquium*. Specifically, an account of Christ not as endpoint but as midpoint is needed.

In effect, Bonaventure's trinitarian meta-narrative structure achieves precisely this calibration. He extends, so to speak, the sense of the sixth age. Bonaventure basically alludes to such an extension when, in Part 4, he avers that the "fullness of time" (Gal 4:4) does not bring time to an end.[82] Consequently, even if Bonaventure does not expound explicitly a thoroughly Christocentric theology of history in this text, he succeeds in effecting a certain calibration in virtue of the text's overall structure: he makes trinitarian the number seven.

After introducing the *primum—decursum intermedium—ultimum* triad, which has a clear trinitarian tenor (power, wisdom, goodness), Bonaventure then adumbrates the sevenfold division of the text. He says that, to understand

---

[81] Goff, "Part I: 'On the Trinity of God,'" 100. One notes in this passage the pneumatological hinge.

[82] *Brev.*, 4.4.5 (5:245a); see also Ratzinger, *Theology of History*, 109-110 (discussed at n57 above). While Bonaventure says that the Incarnation took place "in fine saeculorum" (*Brev.*, 4.4.1 [5:244a]), he nonetheless nuances what this means. The "fullness of time" is said not because "in his [Christ's] coming, time is completed, but because the temporal mysteries are fulfilled" (*Brev.*, 4.4.5 [5:245a]).

the whole shape of Scripture, which describes the "whole world machine," it is necessary to know:

> the first principle of things, God [= Part 1: *de Trinitate Dei*];
>> the creation of those things [= Part 2: *de creatura mundi*];
>>> the fall [= Part 3: *de corruptela peccati*];
>>>> redemption through the blood of Jesus Christ [= Part 4: *de incarnatione Verbi*];
>>> reformation through grace [= Part 5: *de gratia Spiritus sancti*];
>> healing through sacraments [= Part 6: *de medicina sacramentali*]; and, lastly,
> remuneration (*retributionem*) through punishment and everlasting glory [= Part 7: *De status finalis iudicii*].[83]

Herein lies what I will call the *thematic or diegetic structure* of the *Breviloquium*.[84] As laid out in the manner above, it is clearly chiastic.[85] This sevenfold thematic structure depends on and manifests the trinitarian meta-narrative. The origin of the *decursus* is the Trinity, the *primum* (Part 1); the *decursus mundi* constitutes Parts 2-6; and its completion is in glory, the *ultimum* (Part 7). Bonaventure's specific way of dividing this text is unique.[86] That there are seven parts, moreover, is significant: the number conveys "completion, silence, and sabbath rest."[87] This feature alone illuminates the finality of salvation history as pneumatic in tone.

Shortly after the prologue, in the beginning of Part 1, Bonaventure offers another explication of the text's structure. In this presentation, he first identifies God as threefold principle: "the effective exemplar and principle of things in creation," "the restorative principle in redemption," and "the perfective principle in remuneration (*retributionem*)."[88] The trinitarian tenor

---

[83] *Brev.*, prol. 6.7 (5:208ab). I am following Monti in translating *retributio* as "remuneration." In English, "retribution" has a negative connotation, but Bonaventure's use of *retributio* includes the reward of eternal glory.

[84] See Annette Kuhn and Guy Westwell, "Diegesis," in *Oxford Dictionary of Film Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University, 2012), 116-117. The term *diegesis* "designate[s] the narrated events in a story." In the *Breviloquium*, this "story world, and the events that exist within it"—e.g., creation, the Incarnation, etc.—unfold per the sevenfold division.

[85] See Benson, "The Christology of the *Breviloquium*," 251.

[86] See Benson, "The Christology of the *Breviloquium*," 252; Amaury Begasse de Dhaem, "Il *triplex verbum* bonaventuriano: cristocentrismo trinitario e singolarità/universalità della salvezza," in *Deus summe cognoscibilis*, 333-351 at 338-339.

[87] See Benson, "The Christology of the *Breviloquium*," 252.

[88] *Brev.*, 1.1.2 (5:210a).

of this triad is clear. As Katherine Wrisley Shelby remarks: "the Father [surfaces] as the font of all being, the Son as the redeemer of creation, and the Spirit as the perfecting principle of creation that leads it to its end in God."[89]

What happens next is telling. As in the prologue, Bonaventure uses also here a trinitarian framework—God as "effective," "restorative," and "perfective" principle—to introduce the sevenfold thematic structure. Hence, both here and in the prologue, *the trinitarian meta-narrative structure introduces and governs the sevenfold diegetic structure*. He here describes the sevenfold structure as follows:

> Therefore, [sacred Scripture or theology] not only treats (*agit*) of God the creator [= Part 1], but also of creation and creatures [= Part 2]. And because the rational creature, which is in a certain sense the end of all things [i.e., the *mundus maior* is for the *mundus minor*], did not remain firm (*stetit*), but by its fall needed to be renewed (*reparari*), [theology] thus covers (*agit*) the corruption of sin [= Part 3], the physician (*medico*) [= Part 4], health (*sanitate*) [= Part 5], and the medicinal remedy (*medicina*) [= Part 6], and lastly the perfect cure (*curatione perfecta*), which will be in glory [= Part 7], the impious being thrown into punishment.[90]

Bonaventure then arrives at a conclusion and re-uses select keywords from the prologue: "And therefore that alone is the perfect science, because it begins from the beginning (*a primo*), which is the First Principle (*primum principium*), and proceeds all the way to the end (*ad ultimum*), which is the eternal reward."[91] *A primo ad ultimum*: these words recall and emphasize the trinitarian meta-narrative of the text.[92] Then, to emphasize this connection, Bonaventure brings the discussion explicitly back to the Trinity as threefold principle:

> It [theology] is also the perfect wisdom, which begins from the highest cause, as the principle of things caused [→ the effective exemplar and principle of things in creation], … and it moves beyond (*transit*) this, as the remedy for sins [→ the restorative principle in redemption]; and

---

[89] Shelby, "Part V: 'On the Grace of the Holy Spirit,'" in *Bonaventure Revisited*, 215-243 at 216.

[90] *Brev.*, 1.1.2 (5:210a).

[91] *Brev.*, 1.1.2 (5:210a).

[92] See n76 above.

returns (*reducit*) to it as the reward of merit and the end of desires [→ the perfective principle in remuneration].[93]

Bonaventure's train of thought thus demonstrates his intention to integrate the trinitarian meta-narrative structure and the sevenfold thematic structure.

By way of synthesis, the following table collates the meta-narrative structure, the thematic structure, and their trinitarian appropriations:

Breviloquium's Fundamental or Meta-Narrative Structure	*Breviloquium*'s Thematic or Diegetic Structure	Appropriated to
primum / effective exemplar and principle of things in creation	Part 1	The Father
decursus / restorative principle in redemption	Parts 2-6	The Son[94]
ultimum / perfective principle in remuneration	Part 7	The Holy Spirit

The masterful composition of the *Breviloquium* achieves an impressive integration between a fundamental trinitarian threefold structure and a thematic sevenfold structure. This integration accentuates the pneumatic finality of the text: both the *ultimum* of the meta-narrative and the consummation of the thematic structure betray pneumatic finality in that Part 7 *De statu finalis iudicii* is the ultimate, integral *status* of the text's organization. Creation thus culminates in the mystery of the Spirit. The Spirit, who brings the order of divine life to its completion, draws the beautiful cosmic song of creation into its own completion, as well.

2.2.2 Pneumatic Finality Within the *Decursus*

Even within the *decursus* itself, a certain pneumatic finality emerges. At least two reasons manifest this.

---

[93] *Brev.*, 1.1.3 (5:210ab).

[94] Admittedly, it may seem strange to line up Parts 2-6 with the Son; it is not immediately obvious why Parts 2 or 3, or Part 5—which includes "Holy Spirit" in its title— are Christological. Nonetheless, I am aligning Parts 2-6 to the Son simply in terms of the text's macrostructure and in terms of the Son's *governing* role in the *decursus mundi* as a whole. This is by no means an exhaustive way of interpreting the text's rich and polyphonic structure. Furthermore, as I discuss in Section 2.2.2, the *decursus* itself manifests its own internal structure and Part 4 blossoms pneumatologically. The main point to stress is simply that a certain Trinitarian dynamic governs the sevenfold division of the *Breviloquium*.

The first reason is that Part 4, the textual center of the *Breviloquium,* exercises a double function, as Joshua Benson has demonstrated. Benson argues convincingly that the conceptual framework of *ortus— progressus/modus—fructus/status*, which he gleans from the *Breviloquium*'s prologue, "can shape our understanding of the structure of the *Breviloquium*'s seven parts."[95] In brief, Part 1 constitutes the *ortus*, Parts 2-6 constitute the *progressus/modus*, and Part 7 constitutes the *fructus/status*.[96] Within Parts 2-6, however, another twofold division of *ortus—progressus/modus— fructus/status* surfaces. Therein, as a result, lies the double function of Part 4: it is both *fructus* and *ortus*. Benson explains:

> part 2, on creation, forms the *ortus* of creation's temporal movement out from God. Part 3 describes the horrifying turn in the *progressus*, the *modus* that deformed creation: sin. Part 4, on the incarnation of the Word, brings these two movements to completion since … Bonaventure describes the incarnate Word in part four as the fulfillment of creation. … Part 4 brings parts 2 and 3 to fulfillment—to *fructus*. Part 4 also relates to parts 5 and 6, not as *fructus* of creation but as the *ortus* of our recreation.[97]

In other words:

Part 2: *ortus*
    Part 3: *progressus/modus*
        <u>Part 4: *fructus*</u>
        Part 4: *ortus*
    Part 5: *progressus/modus*
Part 6: *fructus*

Part 4's double function underscores the gravity of the Christic center. Christ, in effect, brings to conclusion the story of creation (Part 2) and the tragedy of sin (Part 3), and in his centrality he is the hinge or turning point orienting the

---

[95] Benson, "The Christology of the *Breviloquium*," 254; for his analysis of the text's strucure, which has very much informed my own, see 251-257. Although I do not engage at length with Benson's particular division, one can easily observe the trinitarian tenor operative in the *ortus*, *progressus/modus*, *fructus/status* triad.

[96] "We can see that part 1 on the Trinity functions as the *ortus* of the entire text, much as the Trinity is described as the *ortus* of scripture itself …. We can also easily identify part 7, on final judgment, as the *status* of the entire work, as it will ultimately describe the 'fullness of everlasting happiness': the *status* of scripture described in the prologue." Benson, "The Christology of the *Breviloquium*," 254. This structure is basically a version of the fundamental triadic structure I developed above.

[97] Benson, "The Christology of the *Breviloquium*," 255.

decursus toward the pneumatological mysteries of grace (Part 5) and sacraments (Part 6) in anticipation of the fullness of goodness in glory (Part 7). In a word, the center blossoms pneumatologically.[98] Indeed, Part 4 itself culminates in Pentecost, the sending of the Spirit "who is charity."[99]

The second reason that the *decursus* itself exhibits pneumatic finality is that, in terms of the text's chiastic structure, Part 2 on creation correlates with Part 6 on sacraments. For Bonaventure, sacraments follow logically from Part 5 on the grace of the Holy Spirit. As he writes in Part 6, through the sacraments, "the grace of the Holy Spirit is received (*suscipitur*)."[100] Consequently, the creation of the world (Part 2) anticipates and finds its fulfillment in the mystery of sacraments (Part 6)—encounter with the Holy Spirit.

Therefore, the economy of the sacraments fully realize the sacramentality of creation—"a book, in which the creating Trinity shines forth, is represented, and is read."[101] Indeed, creatures—the material signs of the sacraments—bear within themselves *by nature* a representation of the healing grace of sacraments.[102] God designs creation to be not only semiotic but sacramental. Hence the semiotic depths of created being bloom in the pneumatological mystery of sacraments. The sacraments, in turn, totally actualize the semiotic meaning of creation.

This relation between creation and sacraments emerges clearly also in the *Itinerarium*. In that text, sacraments do not have the monopoly on signs. Rather, "all creatures of this sensible world" are "signs divinely given."[103] In

---

[98] See my "The Center Blossoms, Part 1: The Pneumatological Fruit of the Incarnate Word in Bonaventure's *Breviloquium*," *Franciscan Studies* 81 (2023): 195-235.

[99] *Brev.*, 5.10.8 (5:252a).

[100] *Brev.*, 6.1.5 (5:265b).

[101] *Brev.*, 2.12.1 (5:230a).

[102] "Since, therefore, sensible signs in and of themselves (*quantum est de se*) do not possess an efficacious ordination to grace—although they do possess by their nature (*de sui natura*) a remote (*longinquam*) representation—it was thus necessary that [sensible signs] be instituted for signifying (*ad significandum*) and blessed for sanctifying (*ad sanctificandum*) by the author of grace. Thence they would (*ut sic essent*) by their natural likeness, be representative (*ex naturali similitudine repraesentantia*); by their added institution, be significative; and by their superadded blessing, they would be sanctifying and preparatory for grace, through which our soul is healed and cured." *Brev.*, 6.1.3 (5:265b). Hellmann emphasizes the role of created signs in his "Sacraments: Healing unto Glory," in *Saint Bonaventure: Friar, Teacher, Minister, Bishop*, 9-23 (see especially 11-14).

[103] *Itin.*, 2.11 (5:302b).

a remarkable passage, Bonaventure then develops a continuum between the sacramentality of creatures and the instituted sacraments:

> For every creature is by nature (*ex natura*) a certain portrayal and likeness of that eternal wisdom, but especially (*specialiter*) those [creatures] which in the book of Scripture through the spirit of prophecy are assumed to prefigure spiritual realities; but even more especially (*specialius*) those creatures, in whose portrayal God has willed to appear through angelic ministry; but most especially (*specialissime*) those [creatures] which he wanted to institute to signify, and these have not only the nature of a sign (*rationem signi*) according to the common name, but also the nature of a Sacrament.[104]

Sacraments unveil the sacramentality of creation. Sacraments realize and explicate that which is enfolded in the nature of created being itself. There can only be sacraments instituted because there are first signs *ex natura*.[105] The very creation of the world portrays a certain pneumatic finality in its orientation toward sacramental life.

2.2.3 Conclusion: The Fullness of Goodness (*Breviloquium* 7)

To conclude this inquiry into the pneumatic finality of the *Breviloquium*'s structure, I now turn briefly to the *Breviloquium* Part 7. The significance of Part 7 has already surfaced above, especially when I identified it as the integral *status* of the text: the *ultimum* of the trinitarian meta-narrative and the consummation of the thematic sevenfold structure.

In the opening chapter of Part 7, Bonaventure recalls that God, the First Principle, is *a se*, *secundum se*, and *propter se*. As such, God is the efficient cause in producing the universe (*producens*), the formal cause in ruling it (*regens*), and the final cause in perfecting it (*perficiens*). He thereby calls to mind the fundamental triadic structure of the text, and interprets it. *Producere* anticipates *regere*; *regere* anticipates *perficere*/*consummare*. In Bonaventure's words:

---

[104] *Itin.*, 2.12 (5:303a).
[105] Consequently, to play with and manipulate sacraments is to obfuscate and mistreat the sacramentality of creation itself.

Just as [the First Principle] creates (*producit*) according to the loftiness of its power (*altitudinem virtutis*) [appropriation of the Father], so he rules (*regit*) according to the rectitude of truth (*rectitudinem veritatis*) [appropriation of the Son], and brings it to its consummation (*consummat*) according to the fullness of goodness (*plenitudinem bonitatis*) [appropriation of the Holy Spirit].[106]

Part 7 brings the text to completion. Here, in Part 7, God is revealed as the final cause in perfecting his creation (*propter se → finis → universa perficiens*). Already in Part 1 Bonaventure had appropriated final causality and finality to the Holy Spirit. Accordingly, the finality of the text, which corresponds to the finality of the universe and salvation history, corresponds also to the finality of the Holy Spirit. The following table helps to see the interconnections:

The First Principle	Causality	Appropriation	Divine Person
a se	Efficient (*universa producens*)	Power (*altitudo virtus*)	The Father
secundum se	Formal (*universa regens*)	Truth (*rectitudo veritatis*)	The Son
propter se	Final (*universa perficiens*)	Goodness (*plenitudo bonitatis*)	The Holy Spirit

In a word, the fullness of goodness consummates the story of creation.

In synthesis, the creation of the universe manifests the power of the Father; the governance of the universe manifests the wisdom of the Son; and the consummation of the universe manifests the goodness of the Holy Spirit. Indeed, the grace of the Holy Spirit brings us to beatitude (*ad beatitudinem perveniat*).[107] So in a sermon, Bonaventure preaches: "Speaking in terms of appropriations (*appropriate loquendo*), we are created through the power of the Father, conserved through the wisdom of the Son, and glorified through the clemency of the Holy Spirit."[108] This story reveals that history's diegetic *decursus* culminates in the consummating goodness of the Holy Spirit in an appropriated sense.

---

[106] *Brev.*, 7.1.2 (5:281a).
[107] *Brev.*, 5.3.6 (5:255b).
[108] *Sermo 44*, §7 (*SD*: 437). See also *Dec. prae.*, 1.3 (5:507b); *Sermo 11*, §3 (*SD*:146).

Accordingly, the "finality" of history does not constitute a fundamentally Christic mystery, as the traditional augustinian schema of history from the *Breviloquium*'s prologue would suggest. Instead, the focus is on the Holy Spirit: on the fullness of goodness that is the "consummation of blessedness (*consummatio beatitudinis*)."[109] This is the blessedness for which the human person, and together with the human person the whole world as *mundus maior*, was created. It is the blessedness of intimate relation: entering into the fullness of trinitarian life as a son or daughter of the Father, a spouse of Christ, and a temple of the Holy Spirit.[110] In the reward of glory, the rational spirit sees God clearly, loves God fully and retains God forever: the rational spirit is "totally alive, totally endowed in the three powers of the soul, totally configured to God, totally united to God, and rests totally in God." In this state of complete goodness, the rational spirit "is called blessed."[111]

2.3 *The Sabbath Rest of Souls and Bonaventure's Theology of Charity*

Before moving on, a brief re-orientation would be helpful. In the *Breviloquium*'s prologue, Bonaventure stated that "the whole of time … is consummated [according to the seven-age schema of history] in the end of the sixth age." The sixth age designates the Incarnation of the Word and is followed by the seventh age, which, running together with the sixth, signifies the "rest of souls (*quies animarum*)." This seventh age corresponds to the seventh day "in which God rested."[112] A cursory interpretation might conclude that the finality of the created order thereby lies in Christ. Above, however, I attended to the multi-layered structure of the *Breviloquium* in order to accentuate Christ's centrality and the Spirit's finality.

Now, in this subsection, I consider the meaning of the Sabbath *quies animarum* of the seventh day. To do so, I depart from the *Breviloquium*, and consider Bonaventure's interpretation of the third commandment of the

---

[109] *Brev.*, 7.1.2 (5:281b).
[110] See *Brev.*, 5.1.3-5 (5:252b-253a).
[111] *Brev.*, 7.7.3 (5:289b).
[112] *Brev.*, prol. 2.2 (5:204a).

Decalogue as articulated in his *Collationes de decem praeceptis*.[113] The aim is to bring to light the pneumatology of the Sabbath *quies animarum* in order to illuminate further the pneumatic finality of the *decursus* of creation.

Bonaventure teaches that the two tablets of the Decalogue order us to God—"uncreated being"—and to neighbor—"created being"—respectively.[114] "But God is Trinity," states Bonaventure, true to his consistent trinitarian manner of thinking.[115] Accordingly, the first tablet does not just order us to God in the abstract, but specifically to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. That being so, the first commandment orders us to the Father, the second to the Son, and the third to the Holy Spirit.

> Uncreated being is the cause of all things. By cause, I mean efficient, formal-exemplar, and final. And it has power, wisdom and benevolence (*potentiam, sapientiam et benevolentiam*) …. And these three are appropriated to the three persons in the Trinity: power or majesty is appropriated to the Father, wisdom or truth to the Son, benevolence or goodness to the Holy Spirit. The highest majesty in the Father is to be humbly adored (*humiliter est adoranda*), the highest truth in the Son is to be faithfully confessed (*fideliter est asserenda*), and the divine goodness in the Holy Spirit is to be sincerely loved (*sincere est amanda*).[116]

These three appropriations allow Bonaventure to index the first three commandments to the three divine persons. "Indeed, in the first commandment, humble adoration of the divine majesty is ordered (*praecipitur*) … In the second commandment faithful confession of the divine truth is ordered … In the third [commandment] sincere love of the divine goodness [is ordered]."[117] The following table systematizes the connections:

---

[113] Bonaventure's treatment of the 10 Commandments in the *Breviloquium* is brief; see *Brev.*, 5.9 (5:262b-263b).

[114] *Dec. prae.*, 1.21 (5:510a) and 2.3 (5:511ab).

[115] *Dec. prae.*, 1.22 (5:510a).

[116] *Dec. prae.*, 2.4 (5:511b). See also *Dec. prae.*, 1.22 (5:510ab), 3.2 (5:516a), 4.2 (5:520a).

[117] *Dec. prae.*, 1.22 (5:510ab). See also *III Sent.*, d. 37, a. 2, q. 1 (3:822-823). This trinitarian interpretation of the first three commandments has roots in Augustine and is also found in the Lombard. See Augustine, *Letter 55*, n. 18-20 (CCSL 31:247-250); Lombard, *III Sent.*, d. 37, c. 3 (2:209). More proximately is the *Summa Halensis*' similar trinitarian explication: see, e.g., *SH*, III, n. 282 (4.2:426ab) and n. 285 (4.2:436b).

Cause	Attribute	Commandment	Meaning	Divine Person
Efficient	Power/majesty	1: "You shall not have alien gods."	"humble adoration of the divine majesty"	The Father
Formal-Exemplar	Wisdom/truth	2: "You shall not take the name of your God in vain."	"faithful confession of divine truth"	The Son
Final	Benevolence/goodness	3: "Remember, to sanctify the Sabbath day."	"sincere love of divine goodness"	The Holy Spirit

Bonaventure thereby connects the Sabbath with the goodness of the Holy Spirit.

But what does this interpretation have to do with the seventh age as the *quies animarum*? For Bonaventure, in addition to mandating something morally, namely rest for the sake of loving God (*vacationem ad amandum*), there is also something figurative (*aliquid figurale*) in the third commandment.[118] Its figurative signification is the "rest of souls." The *Summa Halensis*, in its treatment of the third commandment, states explicitly that the "soul's rest (*quies animae*) is in the highest goodness" appropriated to the Holy Spirit.[119] Accordingly, the third commandment orients us toward the Holy Spirit, and in this orientation it prepares us for eschatological rest. The goodness of the Spirit brings rest, *quies*, to the restless heart. When Bonaventure thus speaks of the Sabbath rest in which culminates not just the creation story of Genesis 1 but ultimately the *decursus mundi* as a whole, the reference includes the pneumatic finality of goodness—the goodness, which the third commandment calls us to love.

Fittingly, then, Bonaventure remarks: "I say that this commandment … is about charity."[120] This stress on charity deepens the connection between the Sabbath and the Spirit. How so? To answer this, a brief though very important digression—in terms of this study as a whole—is necessary.

Jean Pierre Rezette describes Bonaventure's theology of charity as follows:

---

[118] *Dec. prae.*, 4.6-7 (5:520b); see also *SH*, III, n. 327 (4.2:493b) and n. 326 (4.2:491b).
[119] *SH*, III, n. 282 (4.2:426b).
[120] *Dec. prae.*, 4.11 (5, 521b).

Charity is not only a benevolent love for God ... but above all an affective movement ... of the spirit towards God, in whom all the aspirations of the creature find the repose of enjoyment. ... Charity is the mother of virtues. It is the bond that unites man to God, the center of gravity of the soul that draws it with irresistible force towards its ultimate end, God, the Sovereign Good. ... The effect of this union is a pacifying joy and repose of the cognitive and affective powers in the possession and enjoyment of the end in view. Hence, charity already provides a foretaste of heavenly bliss here below.[121]

For Bonaventure, that is, charity is eschatological. It is that by which we rest in (*quiescere*) and enjoy (*frui*) God.[122] And this resting in and enjoyment of God is beatitude. Charity leads to true beatitude; it is perfected and consummated *in patria*.[123] It orients the human person perfectly and fully toward her end (*plenam et perfectam tendentiam et ordinationem in finem*).[124] For the Seraphic Doctor, charity is more meritorious than the other virtues because—*ratione finalis quietationis*—love draws us into God to rest in God (*in Deum tendere et in Deo quiescere*).[125]

Unlike faith and hope, charity remains even *in patria*: more accurately, it is there "consummated." Charity is thus disposed toward beatitude in a manner different than faith and hope. In glory, that is, faith and hope reach the object toward which they are disposed and are overtaken, so to speak, by it. That is not the case with charity, the disposition of which "prepares for glory" as that which is imperfect is disposed to perfection.[126] In other words, charity does not just tend toward heaven, but it is meant to rest there (*dispositio ad quiescendum in caelum*): "For just as a stone with the same weight by which it is moved to the ground rests (*quiescit*) there, so in the same

---

[121] Jean Pierre Rezette, "Caritas," in *Lexique Saint Bonaventure*, 29-32 at 29-30.

[122] See *I Sent*., d. 1, a. 2-3 (1:35-42); *III Sent*., d. 27 (3:589-615). The key source for the *uti*/*frui* distinction is Augustine; cf. Van Nieuwenhove, *Introduction to Medieval Theology*, 24-25.

[123] See, e.g., *III Sent*., d. 27, a. 1, q. 1 (3:589-593)

[124] *III Sent*., d. 27, a. 2, q. 1, ad 1.2.3 (3:604a); see also *III Sent*., d. 29, au., q. 1-3 (3:638-645).

[125] *III Sent*., d. 27, a. 2, q. 1, resp. (3:604a).

[126] "And there is another disposition, which does not have the principle of opposition (*ratio oppositionis*), but only of disposition; and such a disposition is charity, which prepares for glory (*disponit ad gloriam*), as the imperfect to the perfect. It is not at all repugnant to it, but rather has expressed conformity (*conformitatem expressam*). And therefore, with regards to the habit [of charity], it is not nullified (*evacuatur*), but as imperfection is removed, the habit is perfected and consummated (*perficitur et consummatur*)." *III Sent*., d. 31, a. 3, q. 1, resp. (3:689a).

manner is the weight of love or habit of charity to be understood."[127] Eternal life is truly *caritas consummata*.[128] As is often the case, the *Breviloquium* contains a wonderfully succinct synthesis:

> The First Principle, because it is first, is supreme (*summum*); and because it is supreme, it is supremely good. And because it is supremely good, it is supremely blessed and beatifying (*beatum et beatificativum*). And because it is supremely beatifying, it is to be supremely enjoyed (*fruendum*). And because it is to be supremely enjoyed, it is to be supremely clung to (*inhaerendum*) through love (*per amorem*) and to be rested in (*in eo quiescendum*) as the final end. Therefore, upright and ordered love (*amor rectus et ordinatus*), which is called "charity," is principally directed toward that good (*fertur in illud bonum*), in which it enjoys and in which it rests (*quo fruitur et in quo quiescit*).[129]

But what about the Holy Spirit? Ultimately, for Bonaventure, God is not enjoyed without the uncreated gift of the Holy Spirit who is Charity. In addition to the gift of created charity, that is, there is also uncreated Charity. Moreover, the gift of created charity is never given without the gift of uncreated Charity—the Holy Spirit.[130] And to have the Holy Spirit is to enjoy God: "Since one who enjoys God has God (*qui fruitur Deo Deum habet*), therefore with grace—which by its deiform character (*sua deiformitate*) disposes one to enjoy God (*ad Dei fruitionem*)—is given the uncreated Gift, which is the Holy Spirit, whom whoever has, has also God (*quod qui habet habet et Deum*)."[131]

Consequently, Pentecost, the culmination of the *Breviloquium* Part 4, is thus the descent of Charity: Christ sends the Holy Spirit *qui caritas est*.[132] In effect, to send this Charity is to draw us into the beatific enjoyment of God. Indeed, the Holy Spirit is the love by which we love God *exemplariter*: the Holy Spirit, "the union of the Father and the Son and the *nexus* of them both, is the unity *to whose imitation charity binds us* (*ad cuius imitationem caritas nos nectit*), according to what the Lord says in John 17: 'That they may be

---

[127] *III Sent.*, d. 31, a. 3, q. 1, ad 3 (3:690a). See also *Brev.*,
[128] See *II Sent.*, d. 38, dub. 2 (2:894b-895a). Interestingly, the term *caritas consummata*, for Richard of St. Victor, refers to the Holy Spirit.
[129] *Brev.*, 5.8.2 (5:261b). See also *Red. art.*, 14 (5:323b).
[130] See, e.g., *I Sent.*, d. 18, a. 1, q. 1, resp. (1:323b); *In Ioann.*, 20.53 (6:515b).
[131] *Brev.*, 5.1.4 (5:253a). See also *I Sent.*, d. 14, a. 2, q. 1, resp. (1:249b-250a).
[132] *Brev.*, 4.10.8 (5:252a).

one, as we are one."[133] "In this sense," comments Fehlner, "it is the Holy Spirit, who, being the hypostatic *nexus* of Father and Son, is that unity according to whose example charity unites us in accord with our Lord's prayer."[134] This union, which begins *in via*, is consummated *per vinculum caritatis in gloria*.[135]

In sum, then, the first tablet of the Decalogue, which orders us to the Triune God, culminates in ordering us to the Holy Spirit. The Third Commandment is about charity: it is thus ultimately about rest and enjoying God, which enjoyment is realized in our heavenly *patria*. To be ordered to the Holy Spirit—the aim of this Third Commandment—thus involves developing a certain eschatological orientation to the rest of the ultimate Sabbath: delighting in the supreme goodness of the Most High.

The Sabbath is a day to order oneself, in an intentional way, to the Holy Spirit. In doing so, we prepare for, and ultimately already begin to enter into, the eschatological Sabbath. We rest in order to prepare for rest. Rest is for love—*vacationem ad amandum*.

2.4 *The Journey of the Minor World (minor mundus)*

Earlier in this chapter, I made reference to the human person as the "lesser world (*minor mundus*)" in comparison to the whole world as the "greater world (*maior mundus*)."[136] Specifically, the reference was to the prologue of the *Breviloquium*, wherein Bonaventure states that the "course of the major world (*maioris mundi decursus*) corresponds to the course of the life of the minor world (*decursui vitae minoris mundi*)."[137] Consequently, for the Seraphic Doctor, the finality of the human person—the *minor mundus*—illustrates the finality of the *maior mundus*. "The well-being of the macrocosm," writes Coolman, "is indexed to the health of the microcosm."[138]

---

[133] *I Sent.*, d. 17, p. 1, au., q. 1, resp. (1:294b), emphasis mine.
[134] Fehlner, *The Role of Charity*, 123-124.
[135] *Brev.*, 5.8.4 (5:262a).
[136] See n65 above.
[137] *Brev.*, prol. 2.2 (5:204a).
[138] Coolman, "Part II: 'On the Creation of the World,'" 163.

The goal of this subsection is to accent the pneumatic finality of the *minor mundus*. Doing so thereby illuminates the pneumatic finality of the whole created order. What follows is not a thorough presentation of Bonaventure's theological anthropology.[139] I merely touch upon key aspects of his anthropology indicative of the human person's pneumatic finality.

2.4.1 Image of God: Ordered To Beatitude

In his treatment of the creation of the soul in the *Breviloquium* Part 2, Bonaventure identifies the soul as capable of beatitude (*beatificabilis*).[140] To be *beatificabilis* is to be capable of God (*capax Dei*), "and this is to be an image of the Trinity (*ad imaginem Trinitatis*)."[141] The human soul is ordered toward beatitude. Consequently, as Francisco de Asís Chavero Blanco has eloquently remarked, "eschatology is the final term of anthropology."[142] The whole eschatological thrust of created being in general thus finds an intensified concentration in the human person—*imago Dei*, *capax Dei*, *beatificabilis*.

Oriented toward ultimate beatitude, the human person thereby emerges in Bonaventure's thought as an itinerant sojourner *en route* to glory. To echo Johannes Freyer: "At the center of Bonaventure's anthropology stands the *Homo Viator*, the itinerant, the pilgrim on the path, traveling from his origin in the act of creation towards the ultimate goal, perfection in God."[143]

---

[139] Particular helpful in writing this section were: Francis de Asís Chavero Blanco, "El hombre y su dimension de futuro. Para una relectura bonaventuriana," in *Bonaventura: Miscellanea in onore di Jacques Guy Bougerol*, 223-256; *Idem*, "Per una teologia e antropologia dell'immagine in san Bonaventura," *Doctor Seraphicus* 37 (1990): 5-35; Marianne Schlosser, *Cognitio et amor: Zum kognitiven und voluntativen Grund der Gotteserfahrung nach Bonaventura* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1990), especially 11-33; Lorenzo Chiarinelli, "La vocazione dell'uomo: capace di Dio, beato in Dio," *Doctor Seraphicus* 56 (2009): 5-16. For a broad overview, see Giuseppe Rocco, *L'antropologia in San Bonaventura* (Vicenza: Editrice Veneta, 2009) and the following entries in *Dizionario Bonaventuriano*: Stéphane Oppes, "Homo," 457-464; Luigi Iammarrone, "Imago – Vestigium," 482-491.

[140] See *Brev.*, 2.9.3-5 (5:226b-226a).

[141] *Brev.*, 2.9.4 (5:227a); see also *Brev.*, 7.1.2 (5:281a).

[142] Chavero Blanco, "El hombre y su dimension de futuro," 237.

[143] Freyer, "Bonaventure's Anthropology and Ecclesiology as a Universal Approach Towards a Vision of a Globalized World," in *Words Made Flesh: Essays Honoring Kenan B. Osborne, O.F.M.* (St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 2011), 123-149 at 127.

To be ordered to beatitude, however, is not just to be ordered to God, but to be especially ordered to the Holy Spirit. This link between beatitude and the third person of the Trinity has surfaced multiple times already throughout this chapter, most especially in light of the connection between charity, beatitude/fruition, and the Holy Spirit just explored.[144] *En route* to beatitude, then, the human person is on pilgrimage driven by and into the fullness of the charity of the Spirit: into the intimate *nexus* of love between the Father and the Son. "The Holy Spirit unites (*iungit*) us to the Father and the Son."[145]

Significantly, as discussed above, a noticeable link between the Holy Spirit and beatitude emerges in *Breviloquium* Part 5 "On the Grace of the Holy Spirit." Therein, Bonaventure remarks that "the first productive principle, on account of his supreme benevolence made the rational spirit capable (*capacem*) of eternal beatitude" and "eternal beatitude consists in possessing the highest good; and this is God."[146] As Bonaventure develops this theology, he emphasizes the Spirit. In brief, to possess God requires the gift of grace; and together with the created gift of grace is given the uncreated gift of the Holy Spirit. Therefore, "whoever has [the Holy Spirit], has also God."[147] Grace prepares for glory.[148] The ultimate fruit of grace is eternal beatitude.[149] In a similar vein, in John 17 Christ prays for the *unitas caritatis* and at Pentecost he gives the Holy Spirit *qui caritas est* so that the Church might make its way *per vinculum caritatis* to glory.[150] To be capable of eternal beatitude hinges on being open to—and ultimately becoming—a temple of the Holy Spirit.

To show how this theology affects the *maior mundus*, I turn to a telling passage from *Breviloquium* Part 7. Bonaventure fastens the consummation of the world to the consummation of the human person: "this world should be consummated when the human person is consummated (*homine*

---

[144] At *Hex.*, 11.3 (5:380b), "beatitude" is appropriated explicitly to the Holy Spirit.
[145] *Don. Spir.*, 1.7 (5:458b).
[146] *Brev.*, 5.1.3 (5:252b).
[147] *Brev.*, 5.1.4 (5:253a).
[148] See Chavero Blanco, "El hombre y su dimension de futuro," 250-251.
[149] See *Don. Spir.*, 1.16 (5:461a) and 2.1 (5:462b).
[150] See my comments in Section 3.3 in Chapter Three of Part One, as well as *Brev.*, 4.10.8 (5:252a) and 5.8.4 (5:262a).

consummato).”[151] Herein lies the *status*, the *finem ultimum et completum*, for which the whole world waits. The whole of creation, ordered towards the nobility of the human form, enters into its own “rest (*statum*)” and “completion (*complementum*)” in virtue of humanity's own glorious and beatific consummation. In other words, not only does the *minor mundus* pilgrim to the *patria*, into God, by the uncreated gift of the Holy Spirit. The whole world does.

In effect, the creation of the human person thereby constitutes the first realization of creation's primordial hope: the hope, imbedded deep within the fabric of the *maior mundus*, that there be a special creature—a *minor mundus*—oriented immediately toward eschatological glory.

2.4.2 The Itinerant Vocation: *Imago Dei, Similitudo Dei*

To be an “image of God,” which itself bespeaks the human person's immediate orientation and thus relation to the Creator, involves a certain existential weight. Something related to yet not identical with *imago Dei* pulls it beyond itself. This pull is the pull of the likeness (*similitudo*). Enfolded within the meaning of *imago Dei* is the “existential vocation” to something more: to become a likeness of God (*similitudo Dei*).[152] “The image,” as Chavero Blanco writes, “is not just a statically possessed seal, it is a capacity to open itself to new perfections from the very structure of its being; it is a natural preparation for a new existential configuration: the likeness.”[153] The image finds its perfection in the likeness, the realization of which lies in the realm of grace: “imago est in naturalibus, et similitudo in gratuitus.”[154] In other words, *imago Dei* constitutes “the precondition (*Voraussetzung*),” to

---

[151] *Brev.*, 7.4.7 (5:283b). See also *Brev.*, 2.4.3 (5:221b); *II Sent.*, d. 1, p. 2, a. 1, q. 2, ad 2.3 (2:42b); *II Sent.*, d. 15, a. 2, q. 1, resp. (2:382b-383a).

[152] Chavero Blanco, “El hombre y su dimension de futuro,” 238.

[153] Chavero Blanco, “El hombre y su dimension de futuro,” 232. See also Iammarrone “Imago – Vestigium,” 488: “Le creature razionali, in quanto sono potenzialità alla *deiformitas*, comportano uno scarto tra l'essere e il dover essere.”

[154] *II Sent.*, d. 16, a. 2, q. 3, resp. (2:405a). See also *I Sent.*, d. 3, p. 2, a .2, q. 1, resp. (1:89): “For properly speaking, the image consists in the unity of essence and the trinity of powers, according to which the soul comes into existence by the Most High Trinity to be sealed (*nata est ab illa suma Trinitate sigillari*) by the image of the likeness.” See also *Hex.*, 2.27 (5:340b).

use Marianne Schlosser's terminology, for deeper relationality "in grace (*in der Gnade*)."[155]

The image-reality is thus preparation to be an indwelling of the Spirit as *similitudo*. This anthropological vision thus manifests a certain pneumatic finality. Bonaventure makes this connection explicit in the final chapter of the *Breviloquium*'s treatise on creation in Part 2. Therein, he describes the world as a certain book in which the Trinity shines forth "according to a triple grade of expression (*gradum expressionis*), namely through the mode of a vestige, an image, and a likeness." He then explains that "the nature (*ratio*) of a vestige is found in all creatures, the nature of the image [is found] only in intellectual or rational spirits, [and] the nature of the likeness [is found] only in those that are conformed to God (*in solis deiformibus*)."[156] The vestige expresses God as creating principle; the image expresses God as its object; the likeness expresses God as indwelling gift (*donum inhabitativum*). Bonaventure continues:

> Every effect [i.e., every creature as vestige] is referred (*comparatur*) to the Creator in the first way; every intellect (*intellectus*) [i.e., every image] in the second way; every spirit that is just and acceptable [i.e., every likeness] to God in the third way. For every effect, however little it has of being, has God as its principle. Every intellect, however little it has of light, is made to grasp God through knowledge and love. Every spirit that is just and holy *has the infused gift of the Holy Spirit* (*donum Spiritus sancti sibi infusum*).[157]

This passage makes quite explicit the pneumatic finality of creation in general and the human person in particular. Created in the image of God, every human being is called to receive the gift of the Holy Spirit and thus become a likeness of the Holy Trinity. To be full of the Holy Spirit is to be made similar (*assimilari*) to God.[158] Through the gift of grace, "with which and in which is given the Holy Spirit, who is the uncreated, greatest, and perfect gift … the

---

[155] Schlosser, *Cognitio et amor*, 12.
[156] *Brev.*, 2.12.1 (5:230a). See also *Sci. Christi*, q. 4, resp. (5:24a).
[157] *Brev.*, 2.12.2 (5:230a), emphasis mine.
[158] See also *Hex.*, 2.4-5 (5:337a)

soul *is perfected* (*perficitur*)."[159] In the "likeness of God" lies the "deiform perfection" of the image of God.[160]

In his reflection on the *Breviloquium* Part 2, Coolman offers an insightful analysis:

> The first two levels of Trinitarian expression (vestige and image) are, in a sense, givens of creation and cannot be forfeited; the third and last, however, the God-conformity or divine likeness, remains to be attained and maintained or enacted. There is a "distance" to be traversed between image and likeness …. The framework is thus not merely a *description* of created reality; it also contains a *prescription* or a prescriptive *telos*: the human creature should not remain merely at the level of image, but propelled by grace should strive for likeness, and once attained, should preserve it.[161]

Bonaventure does not think, that is, that the book of creation consists of vestiges and images in such a way that likenessess constitute a kind of foreign imposition. Rather, the book of creation comprises a "*triple* grade of expression."[162] The category of *similitudo* is not peripheral to creation, but it is a "prescription." "In order for creation to be what the Creator intended," continues Coolman, "there must be creatures who possess not only the divine vestige and image, but also the divine likeness. … Thus, without human dei-formity … a crucial 'chapter' of the book [of creation] is missing."[163] The pneumatic finality of the human person completes the metaphysical panorama of the created book.

Ultimately, the *minor mundus*, perfected through the gift of the Spirit, reveals in turn the pneumatic finality of the *maior mundus*.[164] Indeed, the vestige-image-likeness triad, which encapsulates creation as a whole, is itself trinitarian. Vestiges bear a particular relation to the Father, the image a

---

[159] *Brev.*, 5.1.2 (5:252a), emphasis mine.

[160] *Brev.*, 5.1.3 (5:252b-253a).

[161] Coolman, "Part II: 'On the Creation of the World,'" 162.

[162] *Brev.*, 2.12.1 (5:230a), emphasis mine.

[163] Coolman, "Part II: 'On the Creation of the World,'" 162.163.

[164] Significant in this regard is Bonaventure's own explanation of the division of his later *Collationes in Hexaemeron*. Thematically, his treatment of seven different "visions" corresponds to the seven days of creation. In his presentation of the structure, he makes an explicit correlation beween the *minor mundus* and *maior mundus*: just as the *maior mundus* was completed in six days, so, too is the *minor mundus* through these visions. See *Hex*. 3.24 (5:347a). What is the sixth vision? *Hex.*, 3.30 (5:347b-348a): "The sixth is the vision of understanding absorbed into God by rapture. … For this uplifting (*sublevatio*) renders the soul similar (*simillimam*) to God."

particular relation to the Son the divine Image, and the similitude to the Holy Spirit.[165] The book of creation itself manifests a certain pneumatic finality in this threefold gradation.

2.4.3 Wisdom: The Pneumatic Finality of the Itinerant

Immediately after Bonaventure presents the schema of the seven ages in the *Breviloquium*'s prologue, he coordinates each age with a different period of human life, e.g., to infancy, to childhood, and so forth all the way to old age. This correlation corroborates the parallel between the *maior mundus* and the *minor mundus*. Within this correlation, Bonaventure aligns the sixth age of the world to "old age" of human life. It is thus "connected with death." Yet it is also an age "of wisdom. And so the sixth age of the world ends with the day of judgment, and in it wisdom flourishes through the teaching of Christ."[166] Human life, and by implication the whole *maior mundus*, constitutes a journey to wisdom.

Wisdom is a key theological category in Bonaventure's systematic theology. To try and explicate even remotely its nuanced role and place in Bonaventure's system is not possible here.[167] The aim here is to draw attention to wisdom as a goal of the journey of human life, and to underscore its connection to the Holy Spirit.

I begin with a synopsis of a relevant section from the *Breviloquium*, which sheds light on the eschatological dimension of wisdom as gift of the Holy Spirit. Then I turn briefly to the *Itinerarium* and the *Hexaemeron*. My remarks in what follows focus on establishing connections rather than proffering detailed explications.

---

[165] See Coolman, "Part II: 'On the Creation of the World,'" 161.

[166] *Brev.*, prol. 2.3 (5:204b).

[167] See Christopher Cullen's chapter "Christian Wisdom" in his *Bonaventure* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 23-35; Valentino Natalini, "La Carità e il dono della sapienza nella dottrina di san Bonaventura," in *Quaderni di spiritualità francescana*, vol. 11, *La carità nella spiritualità francescana* (Assisi: Tipografia Porziuncola, 1965), 36-72, especially 61-71. My comments in this section draw from the *Breviloquium*, the *Itinerarium*, and the *Hexaemeron*. Important, however, is also Bonaventure's treatment of the gift of wisdom at *III Sent.*, d. 34, p. 1, a. 2, q. 2, ad 2 (3:748b-749a); *III Sent.*, d. 35, au., q. 1 (3:772-775); and *Don. Spir.* 9 (5:498-503).

In the *Breviloquium* Part 5 "On the Grace of the Holy Spirit," Bonaventure treats the way in which grace "branches out" into the habits of the virtues, into the habits of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, and into the habits of the beatitudes, from which follow the fruits of the Holy Spirit and the spiritual senses.[168] In his treatment of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, Bonaventure links each gift with a specific virtue that it assists. Wisdom, the mother and consummation of the gifts, is linked to charity, the mother and consummation of the virtues. The connection to charity colors wisdom eschatologically.

This eschatological color emerges also when Bonaventure teaches how the gifts assist us in acting (*in agendo*). In his own words:

> For we must rest (*quiescere*) in the highest (*in optimo*), both in terms of understanding the truth (*ad intellectum veri*) and in terms of affection for the good (*ad affectum boni*). The first is achieved through the gift of understanding (*intellectus*), and the second through the gift of wisdom, in which is rest (*in quo est quies*).[169]

In addition to assisting the active life, the gifts of the Holy Spirit also help facilitate contemplation (*in contemplando*). Some gifts are purgative, some are illuminative, but wisdom alone is perfective. Wisdom grants "accessum ad summum," "the secret (*arcanum*) of contemplation."[170] Wisdom consummates the contemplative life.

Then Bonaventure explains how the gifts assist both the active and contemplative life (*in actione et contemplatione*). The contemplative, to turn toward the Trinity (*propter conversionem ad Trinitatem*), should have three assisting gifts: fear to cultivate reverence of the divine majesty, understanding to cultivate understanding of the divine truth, and wisdom to cultivate savor or taste of the divine goodness.[171] Majesty, truth, and goodness are appropriations of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit. Contemplation is trinitarian, and wisdom involves tasting the goodness of the Holy Spirit. Indeed, this reference to taste is significant. For Bonaventure, wisdom (*sapientia*) is related both to *sapere* and to *sapore*: "it begins (*inchoatur*) in

---

[168] *Brev.* 5.4-6 (5:256a-260a).
[169] *Brev.*, 5.5.7 (5:258a).
[170] *Brev.*, 5.5.8 (5:258a).
[171] *Brev.*, 5.5.9 (5:258a).

cognition and is consummated (*consummatur*) in affection."[172] And, "insofar as it bespeaks the savor (*saporem*) of the affect," it is appropriated to the Holy Spirit.[173] Wisdom's link to the affect—and to the Holy Spirit—is important, inasmuch as for Bonaventure the mystical journey, the human *transitus ex hoc mundo ad Patrem*, culminates in the affect.

After his treatment of the gifts, Bonaventure turns to the beatitudes. The gifts prepare for the beatitudes. Regarding the gift of wisdom, it prepares for the beatitude of peace: "Wisdom prepares for peace (*disponit ad pacem*); for wisdom binds us to the highest truth and the highest good, in which is the end and tranquility (*finis et tranquillitas*) of our whole rational appetite."[174] This peace is then followed by the 12 fruits of the Holy Spirit. These render one suited for contemplation (*ad contemplationem idoneus*) and intimacy with Christ through the spiritual senses, which culminate in the *transitus* of our mind. That is, in intimate relationship with Christ through the spiritual senses, the contemplative passes over—with Christ—to the Father. How? Through charity: "through the most ardent charity (*per ardentissimam caritatem*), which makes our mind—through ecstasy and rapture (*per ecstasim et raptum*)—passover (*transire*) from this world to the Father (*ex hoc mundo ad Patrem*)."[175]

Bonaventure offers a concluding synthesis:

> From what has been said, it is clearly gathered that the habits of the virtues prepare us principally for the exercise of the active life; the habits of the gifts for the quiet (*otium*) of the contemplative life; and the habits of the beatitudes for the perfection of both. The fruits of the Spirit … designate the delights consequent to perfect works. And the spiritual senses designate the mental perceptions around the truth to be contemplated.[176]

Bonaventure then traces this contemplation through the—as he will call them in the *Itinerarium*—six levels of the powers of the soul.[177]

---

[172] *III Sent*., d. 35, au., q. 1, resp. (3:774b). See also *III Sent*., d. 27, a. 2, q. 5, resp. (3:612a).

[173] *III Sent*., d. 35, au., q. 1, ad 4 (3:775a).

[174] *Brev*., 5.6.5 (5:259b).

[175] *Brev*., 5.6.6 (5:259b). See also *Itin*. 1.9 (5:98b), 7.6 (5:313b).

[176] *Brev*., 5.6.7 (5:259b-260a).

[177] See *Itin*., 1.6 (5:297b); Regis Armstrong, *Into God: Itinerarium Mentis in Deum of Saint Bonaventure* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2020), 197-198.

This contemplation … is found in other just men[178] through speculation, which begins from the sense (*a sensu*), and comes to the imagination, and from imagination to reason, and from reason to understanding, and from understanding to intelligence, and from intelligence to wisdom or excessive knowledge (*notitiam excessivam*), which begins here *in via*, but is consummated in eternal glory.[179]

The journey to wisdom, of which there can never be too much because an "excess (*excessus*) in experimenting the divine sweetness is … praiseworthy,"[180] is an eschatological journey that begins *in via* and culminates *in gloria*.

These six levels, moreover, Bonaventure compares to "Jacob's Ladder," which leads to the "throne of Solomon"—images used also in the *Itinerarium*.[181] At the climax of this ladder, there is wisdom. The soul is taken above itself "into darkness and ecstasy (*rapitur in caliginem et excessum*)."[182] And without grace, no one can know what this is, as Bonaventure will also stress in the *Itinerarium*.[183]

In synthesis, the theology worked out in *Breviloquium* Part 5 renders the human journey to wisdom as a pilgrimage toward the eschatological: a pilgrimage to peace (*ad pacem*) and to the contemplative *transitus* "from this world to the Father," which *transitus* unfolds *per ardentissimam caritatem*. Such contemplation culminates ultimately in that wisdom that "begins here … but is consummated in eternal glory."

Such terminology—affect, wisdom, contemplation, ecstasy, excess, *transitus*, and darkness—will continue to be utilizzed by Bonaventure in the *Itinerarium* and *Hexaemeron*. Indeed, in the above synopsis, I have intentionally pointed out select moments that anticipate the synthesis of the

---

[178] In comparison to the prophets to whom it was given through revelation according to a threefold vision: corporeal, imaginative, and intellectual.

[179] *Brev.*, 5.6.7 (5:260a).

[180] "Wisdom cannot be excessive (*nimia*), because excess (*excessus*) in experimenting the divine sweetness is more praiseworthy than blameworthy (*vituperabilis*), as is evident in holy and contemplative men who, due to excessive sweetness (*prae nimia dulcedine*) are at times (*modo*) lifted up into ecstasy (*elevantur in ecstasim*), and at times elevated to rapture (*sublevantur ad raptum*), although this happens to very few." *III Sent.*, d. 35, au., q. 1, resp. (3:774b).

[181] See *Itin.* 1.9 (5:298a), 1.5 (5:297a), 7.1 (5:312a).

[182] *Brev.*, 5.6.8 (5:260a).

[183] See *Itin.*, 7.4 (5:312b).

Itinerarium written not long after the *Breviloquium*. The pneumatic finality of the journey to wisdom is even more explicit in the *Itinerarium*, to which I now turn.

After an initial prologue, the *Itinerarium* consists of seven parts. The text constitutes "a spiritual guide."[184] It is a guide to peace (*viam pacis*), inasmuch as it is a guide to "Christian wisdom," "contemplation," "Sabbath rest," and "beatitude."[185] Six chapters lead to the final seventh chapter, that the soul "may pass over to peace (*transeat ad pacem*) through ecstatic excesses of Christian wisdom (*per ecstaticos excessus sapientiae christianae*)."[186] Indeed, more than once Bonaventure invites his reader to be a "lover of wisdom."[187] The division into seven parts recalls that God created "the whole world and on the seventh day rested." Accordingly, "the *minor mundus* by six grades of illuminations succeeding one another is led in a most orderly manner to the quiet of contemplation (*ad quietem contemplationis*)."[188] Alongside (*iuxta*) the six figurative days of the journey, i.e., Chapters 1-6, there are also "six levels of the powers of the soul (*gradus potentiarum animae*)."[189] These six powers evince that the human person was created for "the rest of contemplation,"[190] into which rest the "poor one in the desert" enters after the sixfold journey:

> [These six considerations are] like the six steps of the throne of the true Solomon, by which one reaches peace (*ad pacem*) …; [and] like the six wings of the Cherub, by which the mind of the true contemplative (*veri contemplativi*) is able to be lifted up (*valeat sursum agi*) by a full illumination of heavenly wisdom (*supernae sapientiae*); [and also] like the six first days, in which the mind must be trained (*exercitari*), so as to reach (*perveniat*), at last, Sabbath rest (*ad sabbatum quietis*).[191]

---

[184] Timothy Noone, "St. Bonaventure: *Itinerarium Mentis in Deum*," in *Debates in Medieval Philosophy: Essential Readings and Contemporary Responses*, ed. Jeffrey Hause (New York: Routledge, 2014), 204-213 at 205.

[185] See *Itin.*, prol. 1-3, 1.1, 1.4-5, 7.1 (5:295a-296a, 296a-297a, 297b, 312a).

[186] *Itin.*, prol. 3 (5:295b).

[187] *Itin.*, prol. 4 (5:296b), 1.9 (5:298b).

[188] *Itin.*, 1.5 (5:297b).

[189] *Itin.*, 1.6 (5:297b).

[190] *Itin.*, 1.7 (5:297b).

[191] *Itin.*, 7.1 (5:312a). I cannot explore the connection here, but I mention in passing that there is an intriguing similarity between *Itin.* 4 and *Itin.* 7. I note also that *Itin.* 4 culminates with a reference to the Holy Spirit. *Itin.*, 4.8 (5:308a): "What brings all of this about is the most sincere love of Christ, which 'is poured out in our hearts through the Holy Spirit, who is given to us [Rom 5:5],' without which Spirit we cannot know the secrets of God."

Peace, wisdom, Sabbath rest: herein lies the terminus of the journey.

The contemplative *transitus* is the passover into this peace, wisdom, and Sabbath rest. Importantly, this passover belongs to the affect.[192] It is "mystical and most secret," and it is not known unless one has experienced it. To experience it is possible only if it is first desired. And it is impossible to desire it without being inflamed to the very marrow by the "fire of the Holy Spirit (*ignis Spiritus sancti*), … whom Christ sent on earth. And therefore the Apostle says [in 1 Cor 2:10], that this mystical wisdom is revealed through the Holy Spirit."[193]

Thus emerges the pneumatic finality of the human pilgrimage. The culmination is a certain sapiential revelation—an affective *transitus*—brought about by the Holy Spirit. This final chapter of the *Itinerarium* manifests well pneumatic finality in terms of being the ultimate "point of return" *ex hoc mundo ad Patrem*: we enter into the economic *filioque*—the return to the Father—inasmuch as we enter into the Spirit sent by Christ at Pentecost. This framework effectively mirrors that of the *Breviloquium*: the *transitus* is from this world to the Father, and it is with Christ, but it is brought about *per ardentissimam caritatem*, i.e., *ignis Spiritus sancti*. "It is only in the love of the Holy Spirit," comments Jay Hammond, "that one receives the mystical *transitus* with Christ crucified."[194]

A similar pneumatic finality in terms of the human person's journey to wisdom emerges also in the *Hexaemeron*. To be sure, wisdom plays a critically important role in the *Hexaemeron*.[195] What specifically concerns us

---

[192] *Itin.*, 7.4 (5:312b).

[193] *Itin.*, 7.4 (5:312b). See also *Itin.* 7.5 (5:312b-313a): "Since therefore nature can do nothing with respect to this (*ad hoc*), and effort (*industria*) can do but a small amount, little should be given to inquiry, and much to unction; little should be given to language, and much to internal joy; little should be given to words and writing, and everything to the gift of God, namely the Holy Spirit."

[194] "Appendix: Order in the *Itinerarium mentis in Deum*," in Hellmann, *Divine and Created Order*, 191-271 at 267.

[195] For example: the aim, at least in part, of the conferences is to draw "spiritual men … from worldly wisdom to Christian wisdom" (*Hex.*, 1.9 [5:330b]; see also 2.1 [5:336a]). Bonaventure explains, moreover, that the philosophers, while they were able to provide many teachings, could not teach contemplation (4.1 [5:349a]). They wanted "to reach wisdom" and "promised to give wisdom, *namely, beatitude*" (5.22 [5:357b], emphasis mine). But without the light of faith they remain in darkness (7.3-5 [5:365b-366a]). "For there is no salvation (*salus*) except through wisdom. … Wisdom, however, is neither unsealed (*reseratur*) nor had except through faith. … But faith is not had except through the grace of the Holy Spirit" (14.7

here is Bonaventure's presentation of the "forms" of wisdom in *Hex.* 2: wisdom is uni-form (*uniformis*), multi-form (*multiformis*), omni-form (*omniformis*), and formless (*nulliformis*). I focus here on wisdom as formless.[196] This wisdom is that same wisdom at the pinnacle of the *Itinerarium*; it manifests a clear connection to the Holy Spirit.

To introduce this "formless" face of wisdom, Bonaventure quotes 1 Cor 2: 6-10—a passage to which he refers also in *Itinerarium* 7.[197] In so doing, he links this wisdom to the Holy Spirit:

> We speak a wisdom among the perfect (*inter perfectos*), a wisdom not of this age; rather, we speak a wisdom hidden in mystery, which neither eye has seen, nor ear has heard, nor has it entered into the heart of man. To us, however, God has revealed it through the Holy Spirit. For the Spirit searches all things, even the depths of God.[198]

This passage attests to the formlessness of this wisdom: it cannot be seen, it cannot be grasped conceptually.[199] In both the *Itinerarium* and here in the *Hexaemeron*, Bonaventure draws from Pseudo-Dionysius to formulate his theology of this affective, loving, and revelational mysticism. Bonaventure gleans from Pseudo-Dionysius the framework of "mystical visions" that transcend intellect.[200] It is thus "most secret," and "no one knows it, unless one has experienced it."[201]

This wisdom is the *status sapientiae christianae*.[202] As *status*, it is the fullness and goal of Christian wisdom. This wisdom is the "union of love"

[5:394b]). Furthermore, in contrast to an excessive lust for knowledge, Bonaventure maintains: "The appetite for knowledge (*scientiae*) must be modified, and wisdom and sanctity must be preferred to it" (19.4 [5:420b]). There must be a *transitus* "from knowledge to wisdom" (19.3 [5:420b]). This broad swath, which hardly does justice to the significance of wisdom in the *Hexameron*, at least suffices to hint at its extreme importance.

[196] For an analysis of these four faces of wisdom, in addition to Cullen (n167 above), see Ratzinger, *Theology of History*, 59-91; Jay Hammond, "Contemplation and the Formation of the *vir spiritualis* in Bonaventure's *Collationes in Hexaemeron*," in *Franciscans at Prayer*, ed. Timothy Johnson (Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2007), 123-165, at 146-152.

[197] See n193 above.

[198] *Hex.*, 2.28 (5:340b-341a). See also *Hex.* 18.24 (5:418a). Significantly, Bonaventure quotes 1 Cor 2:9—via St. Anselm—two times at the end of *Breviloquium* Part 7 pertaining to the glory of paradise: 7.7.7 and 7.7.9 (5:290b and 291b).

[199] See Cullen, *Bonaventure*, 26.

[200] See *Hex.*, 2.29 (5:341a), Ratzinger, *Theology of History*, 86-91.

[201] *Hex.*, 2.29 (5:341a). See n182-183 above for the corresponding passages in the *Itinerarium* and the *Breviloquium*.

[202] *Hex.*, 2.29 (5:341a).

transcending every understanding (*intellectus*). "Hence, it is clear that total beatitude is not in the intellective [power]."[203] This contemplative union takes place "through grace." It is "the supreme union through love," which "God has revealed to us *through his Spirit* [1 Cor 2:10]."[204] Hence does Paul speak of being "rooted and grounded in charity [Eph 3:12]."[205] The mind, joined to God, is "in a certain sense asleep, but in a certain sense awake: 'I sleep and my heart keeps vigil' [Cant 5:2]."[206] That is, "the understanding (*intellectus*) does not enter there, but the affect (*affectus*) does."[207] To grasp this formless wisdom means to enter into darkness, as when Moses ascended the mountain.[208] Ultimately, it requires a certain death: "It is necessary that the human being die through this love, so that she may be lifted above (*ut sursum agatur*). For 'no human will see me and live' [Ex 33:20]."[209] This death, however, is not an annihilation of human life. It is *transitus*—penetration through borders. The itinerant "is removed from senses and placed in ecstasy (*in ecstasi*),"[210] "in the elevations of divine excesses (*in suspendiis divinorum excessuum*)."[211] Love becomes totally focused, totally centered on God.

> This love separates, puts to sleep, and lifts up (*sequestrativus*, *soporativus*, *sursumactivus*). For it separates from every other affection on behalf of the sole affection for the spouse; it puts to sleep and quiets (*quietat*) all powers and imposes silence; it lifts up, because it leads into God. And thus it is as if the human person is dead. Hence it is said: "Strong as death is love" [Cant 8:6], because it separates from all things.[212]

New horizons open as when the Hebrews crossed the Red Sea (*transitus maris rubri*), as when the Holy Spirit led Moses "into the interior of the desert," as in Christ's own death and burial.[213] Such new horizons and heights of love are beyond us. Hence Bonaventure stresses: "This ascent takes place

---

[203] *Hex.*, 2.29 (5:341a).
[204] *Hex.*, 2.30 (5:341ab), emphasis mine.
[205] *Hex.*, 2.30 (5:341a). See also *Hex.*, 9:29; *Itin.*, 4.8 (5:308a).
[206] *Hex.*, 2.30 (5:341b).
[207] *Hex.*, 2.32 (5:242a). See also *Hex.*, 20.9-11 (5:426b-428a).
[208] See *Hex.*, 2.33 (5:342b). Bonaventure utilizes the imagery of darkness (*caligo*) also in *Itin.*, 7.5-6 (5:313ab) and *Brev.*, 5.6.8 (5:260a).
[209] *Hex.*, 2.31 (5:341b). See also *Itin.*, 7.6 (5:313b).
[210] *Hex.*, 2.30 (5:341b).
[211] *Hex.*, 2.8 (5:337b).
[212] *Hex.*, 2.31 (5:341b).
[213] *Hex.*, 2.34 (5:342b); see also *Itin.*, 7.2 (5:312b) and 7.6 (5:313b).

through the most strong vigor and movement (*vigorem et commotionem fortissimam*) of the Holy Spirit. … This fire is not in our power to have."[214]

This reflection on formless wisdom, however synoptic, manifests pneumatic finality. The fullness of Christian wisdom—fundamentally relational—hinges on the life of the Holy Spirit within us.

Let us now return to the prologue of the *Breviloquium*, that is, to where Bonaventure had averred that the sixth age of the world corresponds to the sixth age of human life. In this sixth age "wisdom flourishes." Human life is not just a progression toward old age, but a journey to wisdom. And the "*status* of Christian wisdom" is revealed by the Holy Spirit; through the Spirit's "most strong vigor and movement," the sapiential ascent takes place. Therefore, the human journey to wisdom is a journey into the fire of the Holy Spirit, by which fire we passover with Christ *ex hoc mundo ad Patrem*. This sapiential pilgrimage ultimately illuminates the cosmic pilgrimage of the *maior mundus*: the whole thrust of creation is toward the fullness of *spirit*-ual life, that is, life in the Spirit: "supreme union through love."

2.5 *Recapitulation*

This second section of the present chapter focused primarily on the *Breviloquium*. It began with a look at the prologue of the text. Utilizing the traditional seven-age schema of history, the prologue thus seemed to imply a Christic finality of history. This section, however, has attempted to provide a more nuanced reading. To do this, I attended to a variety of topics: the meaning of *decursus mundi*; the pneumatic finality of the *Breviloquium*'s structure; the pneumatological tenor of the Third Commandment together with Bonaventure's theology of charity; and aspects of Bonaventure's anthropology and mystical theology.

This section thereby occassioned inquiry into a myriad of pneumatic finalities in order to accomplish the broad goal of explicating the more panoramic pneumatic finality of creation and thus history. By way of synthesis:

---

[214] *Hex.*, 2.32 (5:342b). See also *Itin.*, 7.6 (5:313b).

- (2.1) The *decursus mundi* of the whole cosmic song of creation is en route to and thus oriented toward the fullness of goodness (*plenitudo bonitatis*) of the Spirit. *Decursus mundi maioris* bespeaks the sapiential unfolding of the whole creation toward its consummation.

- (2.2) The structure of the *Breviloquium* is twofold: a threefold *fundamental* or *meta-narrative* structure, and a sevenfold *thematic* or *diegetic* structure. Both of these betray that the text culminates pneumatologically. The middle frame of the text—Parts 2-6—also culminates in the Spirit: the mission of Christ blossoms into the mission of the Spirit and creation anticipates the sacramental mystery of encounter with the Spirit.

- (2.3) The *quies animarum* of the seventh age of history itself entails reference to the Spirit. For Bonaventure, the Third Commandment orders us to the Holy Spirit and prepares us for ultimate rest. The Commandments of the first tablet, which order us to God, climax in a commandment ordering us to the Holy Spirit. This commandment is about charity.

- (2.4) The journey constitutive of human life constitutes a pilgrimage to wisdom that is ultimately revealed by the Holy Spirit. It is *transitus* through love—*ignis Spiritus sancti*. As *imago Dei*, the human person is *beatificabilis*, *capax Dei*—ordered to beatitude. To be *imago Dei*, however, also implies a certain incompletion: the image is perfected by the likeness, the realization of which lies in the indwelling gift of the Holy Spirit. The book of creation itself is thus completed by this pneumatological reality.

3. Pneumatic Finality in the *Hexaemeron*'s Account of History

In the *Collationes in Hexaemeron*, Bonaventure spells out his most mature theology of history.[215] Therein, Christ emerges explicitly as the

---

[215] McGinn, "Bonaventure's Theology of History," 78: "Bonaventure's *Collationes* contain the most original and perhaps the only real *theology* of history that the period of High Scholasticism has left us."

"center of the ages"—in contrast to the "Augustinian schema" in which he is the "end of the ages," as Ratzinger's classic study has shown.[216] "Christ is the true center and the turning-point of history."[217] What, then, is history's consummation? Although a fully developed response to this question exceeds the limits of this chapter, this third section articulates the fundamental lineaments of an answer.[218] Specifically, I accentuate the pneumatic finality of history, as systematized in the *Hexaemeron*.

First, however, I want to say a brief word about the fundamental insight of Bonaventure's theology of history. In this regard, two images that emerged earlier in this chapter merit further reflection: *carmen* and *liber*. Bonaventure understands the *decursus mundi* as a song (*carmen*) and creation as a whole as a book (*liber*). These classifications are not simply euphemisms for "the stuff that exists" or, to recall Nietzsche, "a monster of energy." Instead, they intimate a critical, yet easily overlooked, feature of reality: interconnected wholeness. The terms disclose something metaphysical. For instance, when a person contemplates Caravaggio's "The Calling of Matthew," the depth of meaning of the oeuvre only emerges after a careful gaze on the—interconnected—whole. To isolate, and consequently dissociate, the light from the figure of Christ diminishes the significance of both the light and Christ in the painting. The same applies in terms of a song or book, although to a different degree: a song or a book is more three-dimensional, so to speak, than a canvas. Nevertheless, to deconstruct a song by extracting notes from the holistic composition or to deconstruct a book by dissociating words from their sentences results not in decipherment but in butchery that advances the nihilistic degradation and evanescence of integral wholeness. If the aim is to decode meaning—often hidden deep beneath the surface—required is not

---

[216] Ratzinger, *Theology of History*, 17.

[217] Ratzinger, *Theology of History*, 118.

[218] A fully thorough answer would require a detailed study of all the relevant parts of the *Hexaemeron*, as well as the historical context in which it was written, especially with regard to the Spiritual Franciscans and their radical interpretation of Joachim of Fiore. I do not enter into these matters here. In addition to Ratzinger's text and the material listed at n19 above, see also Bernard McGinn, "The Abbot and the Doctors: Scholastic Reactions to the Radical Eschatology of Joachim of Fiore," *Church History* 40 (1971): 30-47; Emmett Randolph Daniel, "St. Bonaventure: Defender of Franciscan Eschatology," in Bougerol, *S. Bonaventura*, vol. 4, 795-806; Sven Grosse, "Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventure, and the Critiques of Joachimist Topics from the Fourth Lateran Council to Dante," in *A Companion to Joachim of Fiore*, ed. Matthias Riedl (Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2018), 144-189.

dismemberment but rather a certain contemplative patience, humility, and gaze. To grasp the sense of the book, I need to have the whole book within me, even though I can only read one word at a time. When I listen to a song, I do not listen to the passing of each note per se; I listen to the *whole* as it unfolds. So, too, with the *carmen* that is history's *decursus*.[219] The beauty of history lies not in the mere succession of dissociated events, but in the interconnected order of the whole. Hence Bonaventure says more than once that the succession of times is "not by chance or by fortune."[220]

Herein lies, at least in part, the perennial value of Bonaventure's theology of history. While the precise details of his theological interpretation of historical events as articulated in the *Hexaemeron* may seem strange to contemporary minds, this basic meta-principle remains most relevant. History is vast, yet it is a holistic, meaningful vastness. To contemplate history is to contemplate the *whole* of time unfold toward its eschatological goal. In sum: everything means something, because no-thing means nothing.[221]

3.1 *Approaching Bonaventure's Theology of History*

Bonaventure's exposition of his theology of history in the *Hexaemeron* takes place primarily in *collationes* 14-16.

In the 14th conference, Bonaventure considers what he calls the *figurae sacramentales*. Such "sacramental figures" play a part in Bonaventure's overall program of scriptural exegesis that he develops in conferences 13-16.

---

[219] I have spoken of the integral wholeness of the *decursus* and thus of time in general at various points throughout this chapter. For a stimulating and incisive reflection on time, see Kenneth L. Schmitz, "Temporal Integrity, Eternity and Implicate Order," in *Beyond Mechanism*, 99-127. For example, Schmitz writes: "For … there is a sense in which the whole of time is permanent, the whole of time is successive, and the whole of time is simultaneous; … we can say in a certain sense that it [time] is present or past or future as a *whole*" (111). Schmitz's reflection on time would offer a fitting contemporary dialogue partner with someone like Bonaventure who interprets the whole *decursus* of time as a *carmen* and who sees in time's integral structure—of past, present, and future—a "vestigium aeternitatis" (*Myst. Trin.*, q. 5, a. 1, resp. [5:90ab]).

[220] *Hex.*, 16.16 (5:405b); 16.31 (5:408b).

[221] I have Thomas Howard in mind, who says in his *Chance or the Dance? A Critique of Modern Secularism* (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1969), 12: "The myth sovereign in the old age was that everything means everything. The myth sovereign in the new is that nothing *means* anything."

That is, Bonaventure distinguishes: *spiritual understandings*, *sacramental figures*, and *multiform theories*. Ratzinger offers a concise summary:

> According to Bonaventure, the word of Scripture has … three levels of meaning. First, there is the *spiritualis intelligentia* which penetrates through the literal sense to the allegorical, tropological, or anagogical meaning. … Next to the "spiritual sense" of Scripture … [Bonaventure] places a second dimension, the *figurae sacramentales*, with which Scripture speaks of Christ and the Anti-Christ in all its books. And finally, in the third place, he puts the *multiformes theoriae* [which pertain to the infinite depth of Scripture's meaning].[222]

In *Hex*. 15, then, Bonaventure turns to what he calls the *theoriae*. Ratzinger identifies the *theoriae* as the proper locus for Bonaventure's theology of history. What does this term "theories (*theoriae*)" mean? Bonaventure correlates such "theories" to the "seeds" (*semina*) of Genesis 1:11. Seeds bespeak fecundity. Broadly speaking, then, *theoriae* refer ultimately to the fecundity of Scripture. The *theoriae* bespeak the essentially infinite richness of Scripture: "Who is able to know the infinity of seeds, when even in one [seed] there may be forests of forests and then infinite seeds? Thus, infinite theories (*theoriae*) may be drawn from the Scriptures."[223] Ratzinger thus speaks of "seeds of meaning."[224]

In his study, Ratzinger emphasizes the connection between *theoriae* and history: "The theories are intimations about future times found in Scripture. Scripture points to the future; but only he who has understood the past can grasp the interpretation of the future because the whole of history develops in one unbroken line of meaning."[225] Insofar as *theoriae* consider history, two senses then become apparent: *theoriae* delineate a structure of history in terms of a) times that succeed one another, and b) times that correspond to one another.[226]

---

[222] Ratzinger, *Theology of History*, 7.

[223] *Hex*., 13.2 (5:388a). See also *Hex*., 15.10-11 (5:400a).

[224] Ratzinger, *Theology of History*, 9.

[225] Ratzinger, *Theology of History*, 8. See *Hex*., 15.11 (5:400a). *Theoriae*, however, are not limited to the realm of the theology of history. See, e.g., *Hex*., 17.1 (5:409a), wherein certain *theoriae* consist in considerations of times (*considerationibus temporum*), others consist in the consideration of salvific refreshments (*salutarium refectionum*).

[226] See *Hex*., 16.1 (5:403a) and 17.1 (5:409a).

In terms of times that succeed one another, Bonaventure identifies three different schemata: 1) The first schema is the "common exposition," rooted in Augustine, of the seven ages of the Mystical Body of Christ, which correlate to the seven days of creation.[227] 2) "According to others," so Bonaventure introduces the second schema, "time is reduced to five … callings (*vocationes*)."[228] 3) The third schema is that of the three times in terms of the law: "According to modern and ancient saints, three times are distinguished, namely the law of nature, the written law, and the law of grace."[229]

Ratzinger correctly observes that "Bonaventure uses none of these schemata as his own."[230] Significantly, Bonaventure anchors each of these three schemata to others (e.g., "According to others…"). He explicitly does not proffer them as his own synthesis. Nonetheless, he does not totally reject them either. These schemata are valid ways of viewing history as a series of *successive* times.

The other perspective, however, is that of the *correspondence* of times. Within this framework, Christ is the center of history, and pneumatic finality is implied. Bonaventure begins to develop this correspondence theory already in *Hex*. 15 and it receives its full treatment in the 16th conference.

3.2 *The Decursus of Times: Original, Figurative, and Salvific (Hex. 16)*

The basic principle of this correspondence theory is that the historical unfolding of the Old Testament corresponds to the historical unfolding of the New Testament: "as a tree to a tree."[231] Precisely as such, then, the New Testament can be said *to fulfill* the Old Testament.[232] The historical unfolding of the Old Testament anticipates its correspondence in the history that begins with Christ—the fulcrum between the two times—in the New Testament.

---

[227] See *Hex*., 15.12-18 (5, 400ab).

[228] *Hex*., 15.19 (5:400b). In accord with the parable of the laborers in the vineyard (Mt 20), these five callings refer to dawn, the third, the sixth, the ninth, and the eleventh hour. In brief, the five historical callings are: the beginning of creation; the scourge (*flagellum*) up to Noah; from Abraham to Moses; from Moses to Christ; from Christ to the wedding feast.

[229] *Hex*., 15.20 (5:491a).

[230] Ratzinger, *Theology of History*, 11.

[231] *Hex*., 15.22 (5:401ab).

[232] *Hex*., vis. 3, 3.22 (ed. Delorme, 176).

This correspondence between the Testaments unfolds according to a 1:1, 2:2, etc., up to a 7:7 comparison. For example, in terms of the 3:3 comparison, Bonaventure identifies three times of the Synagogue in the Old Testament, which then correspond to three times of the Church in the New Testament. Put succinctly, the time of the Synagogue is threefold: beginning, progression, and decline (*Synagogae initiatae*, *promotae*, *ultimatae*). Correspondingly, in the New Testament the time of the Church is threefold: beginning, dispersion, and consummation (*Ecclesiae initiatae, dilatatae, consummatae*).[233]

Furthermore, this particular 3:3 comparison implicitly betrays pneumatic finality. To describe the consummation of the Church, Bonaventure refers to the imagery of Rachel and her sons.[234] "Rachel" constitutes a reference to the contemplative life: "ecstaticum excessum contemplationis."[235] In a later conference, moreover, Bonaventure underscores that the Church's consummation lies in the contemplative life. It *therefore* lies in the Spirit. As alluded to above, the contemplative life is inseparable from life in the Spirit. Indeed, Bonaventure says explicitly: the Church "is completed (*compleatur*) *through the Holy Spirit*."[236] I return to this idea of ecclesial consummation/completion below.

Of the various correspondences—1:1, 2:2, 3:3, etc.—Bonaventure prefers 7:7: "It has a great mystery."[237] "The number seven," writes Ratzinger, "expresses in a remarkable way the entirety of reality; it does this relative to God [*mundus archetypus*], to man [*minor mundus*], and to the world [*maior mundus*]."[238] There is no need to go through how these three "worlds" line up per the number seven, which Bonaventure bases on medieval

---

[233] *Hex.*, 16.5 (5:404a); see also 15.26 (5:402ab). Importantly, one observes that this 3:3 comparison is not yet historically realized. The Church is not yet consummated. This aspect of Bonaventure's theology, namely the historical incompletion of the correspondence and thus the "projection into the future,"[233] constitutes an important theme of Ratzinger's study. It highlights, among other things, the role of hope in the spiritual vision of the Seraphic Doctor.

[234] See *Hex.*, 15.26 (5:402a).

[235] *Hex.*, 23.30 (5:449b). See also *Hex.*, 20.27 (5:430a); Myst. *Trin.*, q. 8, resp. (5:114a).

[236] *Hex.*, 22.9 (5:439a), emphasis mine. See also *Hex.*, 22.22 (5:440b-441a).

[237] *Hex.*, 16.8 (5:404b).

[238] Ratzinger, *Theology of History*, 18.

cosmology and anthropology.[239] Ratzinger gets at the heart, however, of what Bonaventure sees: "This relationship … makes us aware of the inner relations of reality which … are a part of the harmony that he confidently believes to be present in the universe created by God."[240] Bonaventure's holistic thought-world surfaces conspicuously. The fundamental structure of reality is interrelational, patterned after the archetypal world of God himself. Being emerges as thoroughly *theo*-logical, and thus ordered and intelligible. The structure of history—the *decursus mundi*—is not excluded from such intelligible wholeness.

After discussing the significance of the number 7, and how it refers to the *minor mundus*, the *maior mundus*, and *mundus archetypus*, Bonaventure concludes:

> This number of universality in the world, in the human, and in God is mysterious. According to this number God makes the world and Scripture, which explicates the course of the world, run (*facit Deus currere mundum istum et Scripturam, quae explicat decursum mundi*) …. Scripture therefore describes [the *decursum mundi*] according to original times, figurative times, [and] gratious or salvific times (*tempora originalia, figuralia, gratiosa seu salutifera*).[241]

The original times are the seven days of creation. These are the seeds. The next set of seven is the seven figurative times: the trees that come forth from the seedbed. From these trees comes the fruit: the salvific time of the New Testament. Fundamentally, the notion of "implicate order"—discussed in Chapter 2 of Part 1 above—would apply here, as well.

I now present, in the following table, the basic structure of the 7:7 schema (more accurately: 7:7:7) in concise form.[242]

---

[239] In brief: *maior mundus*: four elements + three spheres; *minor mundus*: four humors + three vital powers; *mundus archetypus*: triple cause + fourfold *ratio causandi*. See *Hex.*, 16.7-10 (5:404a-405a).

[240] Ratzinger, *Theology of History*, 19.

[241] *Hex.*, 16.10 (5:404b-405a).

[242] See *Hex.*, 16.11-13 (5:405a).

Original Times	Figurative Times	Salvific Times
Formation of Light (*lucis formatae*)	Creation of Nature (*naturae conditae*)	Grace Conferred (*collatae gratiae*)
Division of Waters (*aquae divisae*)	Purgation of Fault (*purgandae culpae*)	Baptism in Blood (*baptismi in sanguine*)
Fecundity of the Earth (*terrae fecundae*)	Chosen People (*gentis electae*)	Catholic Norms (*normae catholicae*)
Light of the Stars (*lucis sidereae*)	The Law (*Legis statutae*)	Law of Justice (*legis iustitiae*)
Mobile Life (*motivae vitae*)	Regal Glory (*regalis gloriae*)	High Throne (*sublimis cathedrae*)
Human Life (*humanae formae*)	Prophetic Voice (*vocis propheticae*)	Clear Teaching (*clarae doctrinae*)
The First Rest (*quietis primae*)	Intermediate Rest (*quietis mediae*)	Final Peace (*pacis postremae*)

"Grasp the correspondence. The formation of light is the seedbed for the formation of nature, and the formation of nature [is the seedbed] for the dispersion of grace."[243] Herein lies the basic framework of the correspondences.

There is no need to explicate the intricacies of this schema. Of concern at this point is the finality or climax of this historical panorama. While not so clear at first glance, the schema betrays a rather rich pneumatic finality. Fundamentally, such finality is enfolded in the very reference to *peace*. "Tunc pax erit."[244] That is, history's *decursus* culminates in the pneumatological mystery of "peace." The intrinsic connection between peace and the Holy Spirit has already begun to emerge above.[245] At this point, I deepen this connection in order to underscore the pneumatic finality of Bonaventure's theology of history.

3.3 *St. Francis: Man of Peace Signed by the Holy Spirit*

For the Seraphic Doctor, St. Francis is a "man of peace."[246] This characterization ultimately has eschatological significance. The *Itinerarium*, a guide to peace (*viam pacis*) patterned after the experience of Francis, culminates in the eschatological peace of the Sabbath: *transitus ex hoc mundo ad Patrem cum Christo crucifixo ignis Spiritus sancti*. That the *Itinerarium*

---

[243] *Hex.*, 16.14 (5:405a).
[244] *Hex.*, 16.30 (5:408b).
[245] See Section 2.4.3 above.
[246] *Itin.*, prol. 1 (5:295a).

consists of seven parts is significant: "the journey," as Milne reflects, "of the mind into God comes to rest in the same manner as God came to rest on the seventh day of creation. The journey towards mystical union is prefigured in the six days of creation."[247] Transcending the confines of the present in its ultimate penetration into Sabbath peace and rest, the mystical life enters into the depths of history's own poetic unfoldment. Francis, the man of peace, reveals the way to the fullness of peace effected by the fire of the Holy Spirit. This fullness is that of the heavenly Jerusalem, of which Francis was like a citizen (*tanquam civis*). "For he knew that the throne of Solomon was only in peace (*non erat nisi in pace*), since it is written: 'His place is in peace, and his dwelling in Zion' [Ps 75:3]."[248] Thus Francis sighed after "ecstatic peace in contemplation" (*in omni contemplatione ad ecstaticam pacem suspirans*).[249] There is no beatitude without peace, says Bonaventure elsewhere.[250]

This reflection on Francis as a man of peace already sheds light on history's culmination in peace as pneumatic. In *Itinerarium* 7, for example, the attainment of peace is inseparable from the fire of the Holy Spirit, the wisdom revealed by the Holy Spirit. Obviously, peace is therein also inseparable from Christ and the Father. To emphasize pneumatic finality is to emphasize, however, the point of return *cum Christum ad Patrem*.

Similarly, in the prologue of the *Major Legend* Bonaventure says that Francis prepares "the way of peace," is an "angel of true peace," and "preaches peace."[251] The eschatological implication surfaces explicitly when Bonaventure concludes at the end of the paragraph that Francis is the "angel ascending from the rising of the sun, having the sign [i.e., stigmata] of the living God [Rev 7:2]."[252] Moreover, Bonaventure states that Francis prepares "the way in the desert of highest poverty."[253] This remark, in effect, links together the *Itinerarium* and the *Hexaemeron*. The *Itinerarium*—"here begins

---

[247] Milne, "Saint Bonaventure and the Divine Order of Creation," 33.

[248] See *Itin*., prol. 1 (5:295a). Armstrong (*Into God*, 160) notes that "Zion," for Augustine, "means contemplation."

[249] See *Itin*., prol. 1 (5:295a).

[250] *In Eccl*., prooem., 4 (6:4a).

[251] *LMj*., prol. 1 (8:504a).

[252] *LMj*., prol. 1 (8:504b).

[253] *LMj*., prol. 1 (8:504a).

the speculation of the poor one *in the desert*"[254]—climaxes in the "excess of contemplation,"[255] and in the *Hexaemeron* Bonaventure avers that contemplation requires especially poverty.[256] With this connection to contemplation, Francis' poverty is an eschatological witness insofar as ecclesial consummation lies in the contemplative life. I return to this point shortly.

In the *Hexaemeron*, the eschatological characterization of Francis intensifies. Once again, he is the "angel ascending from the rising of the sun" (Rev 7:2)—i.e., the angel of the sixth age.[257] Bonaventure utilizes this apocalyptic image to delineate the eschatological personality of St. Francis himself. To echo Ratzinger:

> [Francis is] not only … the bearer of the seal of God [i.e., the angel ascending from the rising of the sun] by reason of the Sitgmata, but also … [because] he shares in the function of the apocalyptic angel of the seal. He is to share in the task of sealing the elect of the final age. It is his task … to establish the community of the final age.[258]

What is this community of the final age of peace?

For Bonaventure, this community is the *ordo futurus* or *ordo seraphicus*—to which St. Francis belonged.[259] In brief, this seraphic order is one of three orders that make up the general *ordo contemplativorum* within the Church. Significantly, this *ordo contemplativorum* Bonaventure appropriates as a whole to the Holy Spirit.[260] The three orders that make it up are distinguished by supplication, speculation, and elevation (*sursumactivum*) respectively.[261] This third is the highest: "The third order is at rest for God (*vacantium Deo*) according to an elevating (*sursumactivum*)—i.e., ecstatic or excessive (*ecstaticum seu excessivum*)—manner."[262] This language calls to mind the Sabbath day of rest (*vacare*), as well as the mystical theology of

---

254 *Itin.* (5:296), emphasis mine.
255 *Itin.*, 7.3 (5:312b).
256 See *Hex.*, 20.30 (5:430b).
257 *Hex.*, 16.29 (5:408b).
258 Ratzinger, *Theology of History*, 38.
259 *Hex.*, 22.22 (5:440b-441a). See also *LMj.*, prol. 1 (8:504b).
260 See *Hex.*, 22.16 (5:440a).
261 *Hex.*, 22.20 (5:440b).
262 *Hex.*, 22.22 (5:440b).

formless wisdom explored above.[263] The terminology is thus pneumatological. Indeed, Bonaventure specifies that this level of contemplation is only possible if sustained by the "*consolation* (*consolatio*) *of the Holy Spirit* .... And in this the Church will be consummated (*consummabitur*)."[264] In St. Francis, one glimpses the contemplative finality of the Church: life totally sustained by the consolation of the Spirit. Francis reveals, moreover, that the not yet realized future *ordo seraphicus*, namely the pneumatic contemplative order, *can* break into the present: the possibilities of the "present" supersede the "present."

Furthermore, Bonaventure understands the "contemplative soul"—which ultimately does not differ from the contemplative Church of the final age[265]—as if it were "a city (*civitas*), in which God dwells (*habitat*) and is seen."[266] It is assimilated (*assimilari*) to God.[267] The notion of *similitudo*, the pneumatology of which I discussed above, lies clearly in the background. Accordingly, an implicit reference to the Spirit here surfaces: the contemplative soul is a dwelling of the Spirit.

Then, in his description of the contemplative soul as a city, Bonaventure explains:

> [the soul] embraces (*comprehendit*) the indissoluble bond of divine charity (*vinculum caritatis*), the unrestricted gift of divine charity (*donum caritatis*), the insurmountable fire of divine charity (*incendium caritatis*), the incomprehensible solace of divine charity (*solatium caritatis*).[268]

Pneumatological imagery saturates this beautiful description of the contemplative soul's embrace. Bonaventure concludes that such a soul is "rooted and grounded in charity [Eph 3:17]"[269]—a passage at play also in his

---

[263] See Sections 2.3 and 2.4.3 above.
[264] *Hex.*, 22.22 (5:441a), emphasis mine. See also *Hex.*, 20.9-10 (5:427a). On contemplation and the consolation of the Holy Spirit, see also *Sermo 22*, §13 (*SD*:295).
[265] See *Hex.*, 23.4 (5:445b).
[266] *Hex.*, 23.2 (5:445a).
[267] See *Hex.*, 23.1 (5:444a-445a).
[268] *Hex.*, 23.9 (5:446b).
[269] *Hex.*, 23.9 (5:446b).

theology of formless wisdom.[270] Hence to be "rooted and grounded in charity" recalls the "supreme union through love."[271]

Then, as if to make the pneumatology utterly explicit, Bonaventure says: "For you are not yet a city of God, nor are you sealed (*signatus*), *unless you are sealed* (*signeris*) *by the Holy Spirit*."[272] The "contemplative soul" is that soul sealed by the Holy Spirit with the "sign of charity (*signo caritatis*)."[273] Here again, the image of the apocalyptic angel from Revelation Rev 7 is at play.[274] Francis is the one sealed by the Holy Spirit in the stigmata, the *signum expressivum*.[275] This sign of charity reveals and confirms Francis' eschatological significance.[276] Francis—the man of peace—is an icon of the contemplative peace of the final age because he is sealed by the Holy Spirit.

Before drawing this chapter to a close, one more aspect of the final age relevant to its pneumatic finality deserves attention. Here I draw principally from Ratzinger's study, and only accentuate the underdeveloped implications. Ratzinger has argued convincingly that, for Bonaventure, revelation is not "closed" because the meaning of Sacred Scripture advances "in a steady growth through history."[277] Revelation does not strictly speaking equate with the letter of Scripture. Ratzinger thus refers to the "'mystical' meaning" or "pneumatic understanding" of Scripture.[278] The understanding of Scripture can thus "be increased"[279] as the mystical penetration into the sacred text goes deeper and deeper. In this regard, a key passage for Ratzinger—and Bonaventure—is 1 Cor 2: 6-10, which has been cited above. Paul speaks in that passage of a hidden wisdom among the perfect (*inter perfectos*) that has been revealed by the Holy Spirit. Ratzinger comments:

---

[270] See n205 above.

[271] See n204 above.

[272] *Hex*., 23.10 (5:446b), emphasis mine.

[273] *Hex*., 23.14 (5:447a).

[274] In addition to *Hex*., 23.14, see also 23.3 (5:445b).

[275] *Hex*., 23.14. See also *LMj*., prol. 2 (8:504b–505a).

[276] See also *In Luc*., 17.44 (7:440a), wherein the "signum Dei vivi" of Rev 7 is the "signum crucis."

[277] *Theology of History*, 9. One might appeal to the Protestant Reformation as an obvious counterexample, and thus conclude that Bonaventure's position, at least as interpreted by Ratzinger, is too optimistic. As I see it, though, Ratzinger's point is not that there will not be false developments or erroneous interpretations of Scripture, but rather that the fullness of Scripture has yet to be revealed.

[278] *Theology of History*, 59.

[279] *Theology of History*, 68.

There is a double revelation, therefore, at the inception of Christianity. The entire dynamic of Bonaventure's theology of history arises from the separation of these two revelations and from unification of them which is hoped for but not yet realized."[280]

Bonaventure's theology of "revelation," for Ratzinger, includes hope for the fullness of revelation, which lies ultimately in the fullness of union and love, i.e., in *sapientia nulliformis*.[281] This fullness blossoms in the final age, namely in the *ecclesia contemplativa*.[282] "[T]he 'revelation' of the final age … must be conceived in terms of this form of wisdom [*sapientia nulliformis*]."[283] Accordingly, formless wisdom, "which was granted to the Apostles as to the 'perfect' depicts the stage of revelation of the final Church."[284]

What I should like to emphasize here is the pneumatology of this vision, which Ratzinger intimates but does not develop at length. The "revelation" of the final age of peace, the mysticism of formless wisdom and thus the seraphic contemplation of the *ordo futurus*, takes place in the Spirit: "this ascent takes place through the most strong vigor and movement of the Holy Spirit."[285] This pneumatic element ultimately entails that revelation is not gnostic, but relational: mystical encounter through the Holy Spirit. History unfolds as a journey into relationship.

3.4 *Conclusion*

This section has attended to the pneumatic finality of history, as articulated in Bonaventure's *Collationes in Hexaemeron*. In the 7:7 correspondence schema of history developed by Bonaventure, the finality of history lies in peace. After the 20th century, and given the current state of the world, there is no need to emphasize the concrete hope for peace that is now deeply felt. To hope for peace, however, is to hope also for the Holy Spirit. It is to hope for the intimacy of affectivity and loving union.

---

[280] *Theology of History*, 62.
[281] See *Theology of History*, 70.
[282] See *Theology of History*, 83–84; McGinn, "Bonaventure's Theology of History," 71–72.
[283] *Theology of History*, 87.
[284] *Theology of History*, 92–93.
[285] *Hex.*, 2.32 (5:342b)

In this way, St. Francis is still today an eschatological figure. He is eschatological not because he is the first wave, so to speak, of the final age of time. Rather, he is eschatological because he is a man of peace, of seraphic and transformative love, and he bears the sign of the living God. It is this love that he encourages his brothers to incarnate: "to have the Spirit of the Lord and its holy activity."[286]

---

[286] *LR* 10.8 (*FAED* 1:105). See my comments in Section 2.3 of the successive chapter.

The Christic Center as Turning Point—The Holy Spirit as Completion

The Christic center of Bonaventure's theological vision finds perhaps its most concise and robust presentation in the *Collationes in Hexaemeron*. Therein, Bernard McGinn identifies in the following passage Bonaventure's own summary of his "Christocentric perspective."[1]

> The Word, therefore, expresses the Father and those things which are made through him, and principally leads us to the unity of the gathering Father (*Patris congregantis*) …. 'I came forth from the Father and I came into the world; again I leave the world and go to the Father' [Jn 16:28] …. This is the metaphysical center that leads back (*medium metaphysicum reducens*), and this is our whole metaphysics (*tota nostra metaphysica*): regarding emanation, exemplarity, and consummation.[2]

As the metaphysical center, Christ is *reducens*. Importantly, moreover, this passage—as discussed also in the previous chapter—exhibits an implicit, though quite obvious, trinitarian texture: emanation ($\rightarrow$ the Father), exemplarity ($\rightarrow$ the Son), and consummation ($\rightarrow$ the Holy Spirit).

Christ, the metaphysical center, mediates consummation, which McGinn calls the "return process."[3] In light of the trinitarian structure of the passage above, consummation—"return process"—thus implicates the Holy Spirit. Indeed, as has already been noted in this study, both the Son and the Spirit are *reducentes ad Deum*: "[The Son and the Holy Spirit] … are *reducentes ad Deum*. Hence according to Augustine: 'The Father is the principle, to which we return (*ad quod reducimur*); the Son is the form, which

---

[1] McGinn, "The Dynamism of the Trinity," 145.
[2] *Hex.*, 1.17 (5:332ab).
[3] McGinn, "The Dynamism of the Trinity," 147.

we follow; and the grace of the Holy Spirit, that by which we are reconciled (*qua reconciliamur*).'"[4] This *qua* is the hinge of the return: with Christ but by the Holy Spirit.[5] Begasse, utilizing an image from St. Ireneaus, thus rightly remarks that, for Bonaventure "the Son and the Spirit are like 'the two hands of the Father,' from whom proceeds and to whom returns (*riconduce*) every salvific action."[6] Indeed, "God," affirms Bonaventure, "sent the Son and the Holy Spirit *ad salutem* of the human race."[7]

Accordingly, while the *reductio* is inextricably bound to Christ the metaphysical center as *mediator*,[8] the full reality of *reductio* is not *just* a Christological mystery. McGinn thus rightly notes that "the *reductio* process is also due to the activity of the Holy Spirit sent into the world."[9] The centrality of Christ as *medium reducens* entails and hinges on the role of the Holy Spirit: "no one comes to the Son except through the Holy Spirit, who leads us to every truth."[10] In a word, then, the complete realization and consummation of Christ's mission lies in the mission of the Holy Spirit. Christ is the foundation of the *reductio ad Patrem* and the Holy Spirit is its perfection.[11] Therefore, Christ is not the climax of his own mission. Rather, his mission is completed in and by (*qua*) another—the Holy Spirit.

It belongs to the very mission of Christ as *medicus* to send the Holy Spirit, "who flows into our hearts (*illabitur cordibus nostris*). This, namely the grace of the Holy Spirit, is therefore the medicine (*medicina*)"[12] which the center mediates.[13] Melone puts it nicely: "[the mission of the Holy Spirit]

---

[4] *I Sent.*, d. 27, p. 2, au., q. 2, ad 5 (1:486b).

[5] A similar formulation emerges from at *Itin.*, 7.4 and 7.6 (5:312b and 313b): our return to the Father (*ex hoc mundo ad Patrem*) is with Christ Crucified (*cum Christo crucifixo*) by the fire of the Holy Spirit (*ignis Spiritus sancti*).

[6] Begasse de Dhaem, "Il *triplex verbum* bonaventuriano," 335. He continues: "Si tratta, cioè, di articolare, a partire dalla fonte paterna e in vista di essa, la dimensione cristologica e pneumatologica dell'agire salvifico." Cf. *Sermo 58*, §14 (*SDD* 2:786)

[7] *Brev.*, 1.5.1 (5:213b).

[8] See *Red. art.* 12 and 23 (5:323a and 325a); *Sermo 1*, §5 (*SDD* 1:76-77).

[9] McGinn, "The Dynamism of the Trinity," 147.

[10] *Red. art.*, 26 (5:325b).

[11] See Section 1.2 in the previous chapter.

[12] *Hex.*, 7:10-11 (5:367a).

[13] Fehlner, *The Role of Charity*, 50: "The ultimate purpose of this [the Son's] mission is one of mediation. This mediation defines the nature of the mission itself." Cf. Balthasar, "Bonaventure," 329.

brings to perfection and completion the sending and the salvific work of the Son."[14]

This relation—what may be called an "implicate order"—between the mission of the Son and the Spirit, as well as the whole trinitarian salvific structure of "tota nostra metaphysica," is eloquently captured in the concluding prayer of Bonaventure's *De quinque festivitatibus pueri Iesu*. It is a prayer to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit:

> To you, most clement Father of mercies, I offer what is yours, I commend myself to you, I commit to you my unworthy self, and I humbly recognize my ungratefulness for all your gifts bestowed upon me. To you be praise, to you be glory, to you be thanksgiving, o blessed Father, eternal majesty, who through your infinite power (*infinitam potentiam*) have created me out of nothing! – I praise you, I glorify you, I give you thanks, o blessed Son, glory of the Father (*claritas paterna*), who through your eternal wisdom have liberated me from death (*de morte liberasti*)! – I bless you, I sanctify you, I adore you, o blessed and nourishing Spirit (*beatissime Spiritus alme*), who through your blessed devotion (*pietatem*) and clemency have called me forth (*evocasti*) from sin to grace, from the world to religious life (*de saeculo ad vitam religiosam*), from exile to the fatherland (*de exsilio ad patriam*), from work to rest (*de labore ad requiem*), from mourning to the most delightful and delicious sweetness of blessed enjoyment (*de moerore ad iucundissimae et deliciosissimae beatae fruitionis dulcedinem evocasti*)![15]

This trenchant prayer also reflects the panoramic structure of the *decursus mundi* explored in the previous chapter: creation, Incarnation, salvation—the fullness of goodness—in glory. Additionally, it betrays the interconnection between the missions of the liberating Son and of the nourishing Spirit. That is, Bonaventure praises the Son who has liberated us from death. This liberation, however, anticipates its consummation in the mission of the Holy Spirit who calls us *ad patriam*—to the enjoyment of beatitude. This prayer thus manifests the pneumatic finality of Christ's own liberating mission.

This pneumatic finality of Christ's mediating mission is the focus of this chapter. It contains three sections. The first section focuses on Christ as "giver of the Holy Spirit." A principal aim of this first section is to articulate

---

[14] Melone, "*Donum in quo omnia alia dona donantur*," 70.
[15] *Quin. fest.*, 5.4 (8:95b).

Bonaventure's theology of Christ's Ascension and to highlight its intrinsic connection to Pentecost. The second section then contemplates Christian life itself as life in the Spirit. Then, the third section turns to "the fount and apex"[16] of Christian life—the Eucharist—and explicates the pronounced pneumatic finality of Bonaventure's eucharistic theology.

So while the previous chapter focused on the pneumatic finality of creation—including history—as a unified whole, this chapter now enters into the *carmen* of the *decursus mundi*. The Christic centrality of this *carmen* anticipates the finality of the Spirit. This specific Christological perspective stresses Christ as "giver of the Holy Spirit." Christian life, in turn, unfolds as life in the Spirit given by Christ so that we might make our way with Christ *ex hoc mundo ad Patrem*.

1. Christ: Giver of the Holy Spirit

"You will receive the power of the Holy Spirit coming over you, and you will be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all of Judea and Samaria, and even to the end of earth" (Acts 1:8).[17] With this verse, Bonaventure begins his sermon on the Ascension. The words of this verse constitute the "final words (*verba ultima*) … of our Savior."[18] To preface the culminating event of his life on earth, Jesus the Word Incarnate directs the gaze of his disciples to the Spirit. Jesus' "final words" before returning to the Father prepare his disciples for the coming of the Spirit. These "final words" thereby link discipleship itself to the power of the Holy Spirit.[19] So Bonaventure admonishes: "Would that we seek nothing curious, but only that which is salvific (*sed solum salutare*), namely that which has been infused by the Holy Spirit."[20]

Bonaventure's theology of Christ's Ascension is thus just as much a theology of the coming Spirit as it is of the departing Christ. Indeed, Christ's departure *is for* Pentecost. "Through the Ascension … the Holy Spirit is fully

---

[16] *Lumen gentium*, §11.
[17] *Sermo 25*, §1 (*SDD* 1:342).
[18] *Sermo 25*, §1 (*SDD* 1:342).
[19] I develop this idea further in Section 2 below.
[20] *Sermo 25*, §1 (*SDD* 1:342-343).

given (*datus est plene*)."[21] This pneumatological perspective, in addition to shedding light on the mystery of Christ's Ascension itself, deepens the theological meaning of Bonaventure's own Christocentrism. It conveys Christ as "giver of the Holy Spirit (*dator Spiritus sancti*)."[22] Bonaventure uses this term when he comments on Jesus' words to the Samaritan woman at Jacob's Well: "If you knew the gift of God and who it is who says to you: give me something to drink …" (Jn 4:10). To know the *who* of Christ, Bonaventure says, is to know Christ as the giver of the gift of God: "giver of the Holy Spirit."

1.1 *Bonaventure's Theology of Christ's Ascension*

In Bonaventure's theology of the Ascension, Christ's identity as "giver of the Holy Spirit" comes to the fore. Especially in its relation to the coming of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, Christ's Ascension accentuates this pneumatic culmination and gift of Christ's own mission.

1.1.1 The Pneumatic Finality of the Creed

In order to develop Bonaventure's theology of the Ascension, I begin with a brief word regarding Bonaventure's analysis of the 12 articles of the Creed from his *Hexaemeron*. In particular, I focus on the end of his analysis, namely, the final four articles. These final four articles concern the Holy Spirit (article 9), the holy Catholic Church (article 10), the communion of saints and the remission of sins (article 11), and the resurrection of the flesh and eternal life (article 12). Bonaventure highlights: "And these [four articles are] according to the Holy Spirit who institutes, unites, and purifies with respect to the three final operations before the last."[23] For Bonaventure, these four final articles are thus about the Holy Spirit.

---

[21] *In Luc.*, prooem., 10 (7:10b).
[22] *In Ioann.*, 4.18 (6:292ab). See also *Lig. vit.*, 10.39 (8:82b): "Iesus, largitor Spiritus."
[23] *Hex.*, 8.19 (5:372b).

In other words, the Holy Spirit institutes the Church, unites the communion of saints that is the Body of Christ, and purifies from sins.[24] The resurrection of the flesh and eternal life look to the Spirit for their full realization in the future. Within the structural logic of the Creed, these final pneumatological articles follow after the Ascension of Christ, which includes belief in his second coming (articles 7-8). The point is this: the Ascension effectively emerges as the foundation for the mission of the Spirit.

Such a conclusion may seem at first glance a bit precipitous. Bonaventure's earlier comments from the third collation, however, corroborate it. Christ ascends (*Christus ascendit*) so that the Holy Spirit might descend (*descendit Spiritus sanctus*).[25] "For just as a cloud ascends upwards, so that later it rains, so Christ ascends [see Acts 1:9], so that he may give his gifts …. For he first gave the Holy Spirit on earth in a hidden manner (*occulte*), but then in a manifest manner (*manifeste*) after he ascended."[26] Bonaventure ties Christ's Ascension theologically to the gift of the Holy Spirit: the Ascension does not, therefore, comprise a kind of final scene drawing the story to its end. Rather, the Ascension opens a new chapter.

This perspective coheres well with what Bonaventure—drawing from Augustine and Bernard—then says in a later collation: "the Apostles' love for the flesh of Christ (*dilectio ad carnem Christi*) impeded (*impediebat*) the advent of the Holy Spirit."[27] Such a remark ultimately evinces that the centrality of Christ points beyond Christ. Bonaventure's Christocentrism culminates in the *adventus Spiritus sancti*.

---

[24] It would be incorrect, however, to divorce the founding of the Church from Christ. In fact, drawing from the patristic tradition, Bonaventure likens the blood and water that pour forth from the Crucified Christ to the sacraments "by which the Church is formed" (*IV Sent.*, prooem., [4:2b]). He also compares the Church to Noah's Ark; just as Noah built the ark to save humanity, so did Christ build the Church with the wood of the cross. This ecclesial ark is "held together by the glue of charity (*bitumine caritatis contextae*)" (*In Luc.*, 17.46 [7:440b]). Christ's ecclesial mission is completed and brought to consummation in the—implicated—ecclesial mission of the Holy Spirit. "For St. Bonaventure to affirm that charity is the essence of Church unity is for him to affirm the presence of the Holy Spirit, wherever, whenever, and whatever degree and state the Church or mystical body of Christ is actualized" (Fehlner, *The Role of Charity*, 41).

[25] See *Hex.*, 3.19 (5:346b).

[26] *Hex.*, 3.19 (5:346b).

[27] *Hex.*, 19.21 (5:423b). I return to this point in Sections 1.1.3-5 below.

1.1.2 *Ascensio Christi*: *Adventus Spiritus Sancti*

Christ's *ascensio* and the Spirit's *descensio* thus constitute an "implicate order": the advent of the Spirit is enfolded within the Ascension of Christ. The fullness of Christ's mission transcends Christ, inasmuch as Christ himself prepares for the Spirit. Christ's Ascension begins the pneumatic chapter, so to speak, of Christ's triumph.

A key Gospel narrative that substantiates this perspective is John 16. In his discourse therein, Christ consoles the disciples, saddened by his foretold departure. He consoles them, according to Bonaventure, through the *Spiritus sancti promissio*. The fulfillment of Christ's promise lies in his departure (*impletur in suo recessu*).[28] Sadness, Bonaventure says, fills the hearts of his disciples (see Jn 16:6) "because they were considering the absence [of Christ] only and not the fruit of the absence (*absentiae fructum*)."[29] The fruit of his absence is the Spirit. Theologically, the point is rather fascinating: the "absence" of Christ is fruitful. Christ's mission culminates fruitfully in the advent of the Spirit.

Hence Christ's consoling response: "It is beneficial for you (*expedit vobis*) that I should go" (Jn 16:7). The *ratio* behind this statement is: "For if I do not leave, the Paraclete will not come to you."[30] To disconnect the Ascension from Pentecost, or to contemplate the Ascension merely as the terminating farewell of Christ's life on earth, is to overlook—or worse, to discount—the very fruit of the Ascension and so Christ's mission itself.

In the course of his commentary, Bonaventure explains *why* the Spirit was not given before Christ's Ascension. He identifies a threefold reason: on behalf of the recipients (*ex parte suscipientium*), on behalf of the one sending (*ex parte mittentis*), and on behalf of both (*ex parte utriusque*).[31]

---

[28] *In Ioann.*, 16.13 (6:458a); see also 16.10 (6:457b): "consolatio est ex Spiritus sancti missione."

[29] *In Ioann.*, 16.12 (6:458a).

[30] *In Ioann.*, 16.13 (6:458a). See also *Sermo 25*, §1 (*SD*:309).

[31] *In Ioann.*, 16.24 (6:460a). Bonaventure does not think that the Holy Spirit is inactive or not given in any manner before the Ascension. In the course of his commentary of John 7, he maintains that "the giving (*datio*) of the Holy Spirit is threefold: manifest, more manifest, and most manifest (*manifesta, manifestior, manifestissima*). It was manifest in the prophets and in those who performed miracles before the Passion; it was more manifest in [Christ's] breathing [on the disciples] (*insufflatione*) after the Resurrection [see Jn 20:22], because it

Regarding the first reason, Bonaventure avers that the disciples—consoled by the corporeal presence of Christ—did not yet have a desire for another type of consolation. "But God does not want his gifts to be held in contempt (*contemni*). Therefore, he does not give except to those who merit; it was thus necessary that Christ be separated from them (*ab eis separari*)."[32] The Ascension thus plays a transformative role in the existential attitude of the disciples. It aims to instill in them a certain desire—a desire that transcends corporeality. In this way, the Ascension prefaces, inasmuch as it constitutes Christ's final preparation of his disciples for, the Spirit's advent.

Regarding the second reason, Bonaventure refers to John 7:39. Christ will give the Spirit, but not until he himself is glorified. When the glory of the Word Incarnate is manifested, so too is Christ revealed as giver of the Spirit.

Regarding the third reason, Bonaventure explains: "because still there remained enmity (*adhuc manebant inimicitiae*) between us and God. Therefore, first it was necessary that reconcilation take place (*fieri reconciliationem*) before the gift (*donationem*) of the Holy Spirit. Thus, it was necessary that Christ suffer before the Holy Spirit be sent."[33] In other words, Christ needed first to effect "reconciliation" (see Rom 5:10–11) in order to bridge our relation to God, thereby preparing for the mission of the Holy Spirit. *Reconcilatio* prefaces *donatio*. The overcoming of enmity sets the stage for even greater intimacy in the gift of the Holy Spirit.

Christ's reparative mission thereby looks to the Spirit for its *completio*. Bonaventure's commentary of Jesus' own prediction of the Passion in Luke 18 renders explicit this pneumatic finality. In Luke 18:32-33, Christ tells the disciples that the Son of Man will be handed over, mocked, scourged, spat upon, killed, and will then ultimately rise. Bonaventure, ever aware of

---

was given as a visible sign—as breath (*ut flatu*). But it was most manifest after the Ascension, because [it was given] as a visible and audible sign; and accordingly, what is given most manifestly is given most abundantly. When, therefore, it is said 'had not yet been given,' it should be understood as: evidently and in abundance." *In Ioann.*, 7.57 (6:350b). See also Giuseppe Ferraro, "Lo Spirito Santo nel commento di San Bonaventura al quarto Vangelo," *Antonianum* 49 (1974): 448-470 at 457-458; *III Sent.*, d. 16, au., q. 1, resp. (1:279b). Fehlner (*Role of Charity*, 75-76) remarks that, although the Holy Spirit is by no means inactive before Christ, "the Holy Spirit was not sent in a visible fashion, until the Son appeared in the flesh, in order to show that the mission of the Son finds its complement in the mission of the Holy Spirit."

[32] *In Ioann.*, 16.24 (6:460a).
[33] *In Ioann.*, 16.24 (6:460a).

numerical similarities, sees a correlation between these six stages with the six days of creation. That means there must be a seventh to culminate the series:

> In these six [stages leading to the Resurrection] … the universality of the work of reparation (*operum reparationis*) is rightly and radically encapsulated (*recte clauditur radicaliter*). Just as in six days the whole word was completed (*fuit perfectus*), so also in these six consists the work of reparation (*opus reparationis*). And finally, the gift (*datio*) of the Holy Spirit follows, as on the seventh day. About this mystery it is said in Genesis 2: "God *completed* (*complevit*) on the seventh day all of his work"; "and he blessed the seventh day and sanctified it." In this, the gift of sevenfold grace is understood. John 7: "The Spirit had not yet been given, because Jesus had not yet been glorified" [v. 39].[34]

The Spirit as *completio Trinitatis* within the inner life of God is the *completio reparationis* within the economy of salvation history.[35] As God sanctified the seventh day, so the "mission of the Holy Spirit is to sanctify creation."[36] The fullness of Christ's reparative work entails the sanctifying gift of the Spirit he sent.

1.1.3 From Carnal to Spiritual Love

"'If, however, I will go, I shall send him [the Holy Spirit] to you [Jn 16:7],' because with the *visible* consolation [of Christ's corporeal presence] removed, an *invisible* Comforter (*consolator*) will be given to you."[37] The visible prepares for the invisible. Flesh prepares for spirit. For Bonaventure, the Ascension facilitates this development from carnality to spirituality— more specifically, from carnal to spiritual love.

> "I still have much to say to you; but you are not now able to bear it" [Jn 17:12]. And the reason for this was because they were still carnal (*carnales*). Hence 1 Corinthians 3: "I could not speak to you as if you were spiritual (*quasi spiritualibus*), but as carnal (*carnalibus*). For you were not yet able, and now still you are unable" [v. 1]. But this carnality (*carnalitas*) had been removed through the advent of the Holy Spirit (*per adventum Spiritus sancti*).[38]

---

[34] *In Luc.*, 18.56 (7:469ab), emphasis mine.
[35] I attend specifically to Bonaventure's theology of Christ's *reparatio* in Section 2.1 below.
[36] *I Sent.*, d. 15, p. 2, dub. 4 (1:275a).
[37] *In Ioann.*, 16.13 (6:458a), emphasis mine.
[38] *In Ioann.*, 16.19 (6:459a).

The advent of the Spirit is transformative. It opens new horizons for discipleship, as it effects in us a certain spiritual transformation.

Jesus prepares his disciples for this transformative advent. For this reason he is not "continuously" with his disciples after the Resurrection. When with them in the flesh, they yet "loved him carnally (*carnaliter*)," but by interspersing his appearances after the Resurrection, Christ was "disposing them to spiritual love (*ad spiritualem amorem*) and through this (*et per hoc*) for the reception of the Holy Spirit (*ad receptionem Spiritus sancti*)." Accordingly, Christ "withdrew from [their] eyes [his] corporeal presence gradually (*paulatim*), until he would withdraw fully (*plene*) in the Ascension, and then their love would be entirely spiritual (*omnino spiritualis*). Therefore, it was written above in John 16: 'Unless I leave, the Paraclete will not come to you' [v. 7]."[39] The Word as Incarnate orients flesh to the Spirit. For the Seraphic Doctor, the Incarnate Christ prepares and educates his disciples for love that is entirely spiritual.

In a similar vein, in a sermon on the Ascension, Bonaventure identifies three reasons why Christ came into the world: to enlighten believers *per testimonia veritatis*, to strengthen the hopeful *per promessa aeternitatis*, and to inflame lovers *per incitamenta dilectionis*. Relevant here is this final reason. To corroborate his position, Bonaventure cites Luke 12:49: "I have come to send fire to the earth."[40] Christ came, therefore, to "rekindle the fire to draw us from carnal love (*ab amore carnalium removeret*), and to inflame us with celestial love (*ad amorem caelestium inflammaret*). Hence it says in the Gospel: 'If I do not leave, the Paraclete will not come' [Jn 16:7]."[41] To enkindle this inflammation of love, Christ—after his Ascension—sends the Holy Spirit.[42] "So long as the Apostles had the consolation of Christ in the

---

[39] *In Ioann.*, 21.29 (6:524b).

[40] *Sermo 25*, §11 (*SDD* 1:351-352).

[41] *Sermo 25*, §11 (*SDD* 1:352). See also Bonaventure's commentary on Luke 12:49: *In Luc.*, 12.70 (7:330b-331a).

[42] See also *In Luc.*, 24:40 (7:597b), wherein Bonaventure explains that in their encounter with the risen Lord at Emmaus, the disciples' hearts burned because the Word of Christ inflamed (*inflammaverat*) their hearts. He then goes on to say that this inflammation takes place because the Word sends the Holy Spirit: "The Word does this by sending (*immittendo*) the Holy Spirit."

flesh, they would not receive the Spirit of love."[43] Christ came to set the earth on fire with the Holy Spirit.[44]

This progression from carnal to spiritual love is thus critical for Bonaventure's understanding of the pneumatic finality—the pentecostal culmination—of Christ's mission. What, however, is the precise difference between carnal and spiritual love? To understand this distinction, the perspectives of Augustine and Bernard—both of whom Bonaventure had referenced in a passage quoted earlier[45]—are key.

1.1.4 From Carnal to Spiritual Love: St. Augustine

For Augustine, before the Ascension, the disciples are consoled by Christ's corporeal presence.[46] Christ's words in John 16 about his departure thus inevitably sadden them. Augustine, like Bonaventure after him, links Christ's promise of the Paraclete in John 16 to the fact that he will soon no longer be present corporeally to the disciples. Too fastened to the flesh, they could only see in the flesh. "But he [Christ] knew what was more expedient (*expediret* [cf. Jn 16:7]) for them, because interior vision (*visus interior*)— with which the Holy Spirit was about to console them—is certainly better."[47] The visible thus prepares for the invisible. On this point, Bonaventure's augustinianism clearly emerges.

For Augustine, Christ goes away in the flesh because he does not want only to be loved *carnaliter*. Hence is it "expedient" that he leave and the Paraclete come. "If I do not take away the soft food with which I have fed you, then you will not hunger for solid food; if you cling carnally to the flesh (*carni carnaliter haeseritis*), you will not be capable of the Holy Spirit (*capaces Spiritus*)."[48] This maturation—this progression away from the flesh and toward the spiritual (*ex carnalibus vel animalibus essent spiritales*

---

[43] *Sermo 25*, §11 (*SDD* 1:352).
[44] See also *In Luc.*, 3.39 (7:79b).
[45] See n27 above.
[46] My comments on Augustine are based on "Tractatus XCIV" (CCSL 36:561-564).
[47] Augustine, "Tractatus XCIV," 4 (CCSL 36:563).
[48] Augustine, "Tractatus XCIV," 4 (CCSL 36:563).

futuri)—results ultimately in a greater capacity to have the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.[49]

In sum, then, this maturation of love involves deeper relationality—ultimately, the gift of the Holy Spirit and transcendence of corporeal limitations.

1.1.5 From Carnal to Spiritual Love: St. Bernard of Clairvaux

Turning now to St. Bernard, one finds a systematic account of love that is carnal, rational, and spiritual.[50] This triple distinction corresponds, for Bernard, to the way that Jesus loved: sweetly (*dulciter*), wisely (*sapienter*), and strongly (*fortiter*). And to love in this way is to love with all one's "heart (*ex toto corde*)" (→ carnal love), "soul (*ex tota anima*)" (→ rational love), and "strength (*ex tota virtute*)" (→ spiritual love).[51]

The thought of Christ's absence, i.e. his Ascension, thus saddens the disciples because, although they loved him, they did not love him with the fullness of love. "They loved him carnally, but not rationally. They thus loved him with their whole heart, but not with their whole soul."[52] Progression to a love not bound by the flesh is decisive for Bernard. Indeed, he ultimately concludes that the "foremost cause (*praecipuam causam*)" of the invisible God becoming man so as to be seen in the flesh was that he might draw the affections of carnal men and women "to the salvific love of his flesh" in order that they would be led gradually to "spiritual love."[53] The Incarnation facilitates deeper intimacy: it is God's invitation to love.

---

[49] Augustine, "Tractatus XCIV," 5 (CCSL 36:564). The anthropology of *capax Dei* here comes to mind. Its "realization," so to speak, lies in the human person becoming *capax Spiritus*. In his *Breviloquium*, Bonaventure insinuates similarly: in possessing the Spirit, the human person possesses—enters into intimate relation with—the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; see *Brev.*, 5.1.4-5 (5:253a).

[50] My comments on Bernard are based on "Sermo XX," in *Sancti Bernardi Opera*, vol. 1, *Sermones super Cantica Canticorum: 1-35*, ed. J. Leclercq, C. H. Talbot, H. M. Rochais (Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1957), 114-121. See also, however, "Epistola CDLXII," in *Sancti Bernardi Opera*, vol. 8, *Epistolae*, ed. J. Leclercq and H. Rochais (Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1977), 438-445.

[51] "Sermo XX," III.4 (*SBO* 1:116).

[52] "Sermo XX," IV.5 (*SBO* 1:117).

[53] "Sermo XX," V.6 (*SBO* 1:118). Bonaventure himself expounds a similar view; see *Brev.*, 4.1.3 (5:241b), wherein he says that, although created "spiritual," sin rendered

Carnal love, for Bernard, plays a part in the progression and maturation of our love. It is love focused on the humanity of Christ. Rational love, though, is deeper: it sees the Word as wisdom, justice, truth, and so forth. Spiritual love, then, by the help of the Spirit loves with such a strength that it can withstand any difficulty or trial—even death. In Bernard's own words: "Such carnal love, however, is good. Through it, carnal life is excluded, and the world is held in contempt and overcome. It progresses (*proficitur*), when it becomes rational. It is perfected (*perficitur*), when it is made spiritual."[54]

To conclude: when Bonaventure distinguishes between carnal and spiritual love, he is drawing from this tradition. This distinction underscores the interconnection between Christ's Ascension and the *adventus Spiritus sancti*. Without reference to the latter, a theology of the Ascension remains not only fundamentally incomplete, but basically irrelevant to Christian spirituality. A more complete theology of the Ascension accentuates that Christ's reparative mission ultimately draws us into the depths of an intimacy not limited by the flesh: into the depths of spiritual love. The Ascension—and by implication the Incarnation itself—is, for this very reason, oriented toward the Holy Spirit.

1.2 *The Pentecostal Culmination of the Incarnate Word*

I now turn to the conclusion of Bonaventure's Christological treatment in the *Breviloquium*, which manifests the pneumatic orientation of Christ's mission. In a word, in Part 4 *De incarnatione Verbi* of the *Breviloquium*, the centrality of Christ culminates explicitly in Pentecost: it blossoms into the mission of the Spirit.

As discussed in the previous chapter, Benson's study of the *Breviloquium* has demonstrated that Part 4 on the Incarnation functions within the sevenfold structure of the text as both *fructus* and *ortus*.[55] Benson has also shown, however, that the triadic framework of *ortus—progressus/modus—*

---

humanity "carnal, animal, and sensual." The Word became flesh in order to draw the human person out of that carnal state.

[54] "Sermo XX," IV.9 (*SBO* 1:120).

[55] See Section 2.2.2 of the previous chapter.

status/fructus structures Part 4 itself. "The union of [Christ's] natures discussed in *Brev.* 4.2-4.4 forms the *ortus*, the fullness of [Christ's] gifts in *Brev.* 4.5-4.7 forms the *modus*, and the passion [of Christ] in *Brev.* 4.8-4.10 forms the *fructus*."[56] Consequently, Bonaventure's treatment of Christ's Passion constitutes the *fructus* of his treatment of the Incarnate Word.

This conclusion, however, could be more precise. That is, it is not simply the treatment of the Passion as such, but more specifically the *fructus* of the Passion itself that ultimately culminates Part 4. To grasp this, it is important to see that, as Benson also argues, the triadic framework of *ortus—progressus/modus—status/fructus* functions even within the three divisions of *Breviloquium* 4.2-4.4 (union of natures), 4.5-4.7 (the gifts of Christ), and 4.8-4.10 (the Passion).[57] These three divisions each have their own *ortus*, *progressus/modus*, *status/fructus*. Accordingly, Bonaventure's treatment of the Passion at 4.8-4.10 has its own internal *fructus*:

- *Brev.*, 4.8 (the condition of the one who suffers) = *ortus*
- *Brev.*, 4.9 (the mode of the one who suffered) = *progressus/modus*
- *Brev.*, 4.10 (the *fructus* of the one who suffered) = *status/fructus*

Indeed, the tenth and final chapter of *Breviloquium* 4 literally begins: "De exitu passionis Christi et *fructu* …"[58] Benson concludes: "This chapter [*Breviloquium* 4.10] is the ultimate *fructus* of Bonaventure's investigation of the incarnate Word and also establishes Christ further as the *ortus* of the life of grace that Bonaventure will examine in part 5 [*De gratia Spiritus sancti*]."[59]

Therefore, the *Breviloquium* Part 4 manifests pneumatic finality. The final chapter of *Breviloquium* 4 ends with Christ sending the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. The ultimate *fructus* of the Incarnate Word is the Spirit he sends. *Whom* Christ sends, and not *what* Christ does, brings Christ's mission to its completion. This is how Bonaventure concludes his treatment of *Breviloquium* Part 4.

---

[56] Benson, "The Christology of the *Breviloquium*," 259.

[57] Each thematic block has its own *ortus—progressus/modus—status/fructus*. See Benson, "The Christology of the *Breviloquium*," 259-261.

[58] *Brev.*, 4.10.1 (5:250b), emphasis mine.

[59] Benson, "The Christology of the *Breviloquium*," 282.

In one of his sermons, Bonaventure expresses in synthesis this dynamic. First, Christ grabs hold of humanity, sick on account of sin, "in the Incarnation"; second, Christ heals the sickness "in the Passion"; third, he sends away the healed person "free … in the mission of the Holy Spirit."[60] The Incarnation culminates penultimately in the Passion and ultimately in the mission of the Spirit. Christ liberates us to be free in the Spirit.[61]

I turn now to the content itself of *Breviloquium* 4.10, the *fructus* of Bonaventure's treatment of the Passion. Bonaventure begins by identifying the fruit of the Passion:

- the descent of Christ's soul to hell;
- his Resurrection on the third day;
- his Ascension after 40 days;
- his sending of the Holy Spirit after 10 days.[62]

Bonaventure explains the *ratio* for these four aspects of the fruit of the Passion as follows:

> The reason for understanding these things is this: because, just as Christ, as the Uncreated Word, formed (*formavit*) all things in a most complete way (*perfectissime*), so as the Incarnate Word he should (*debuit*) reform (*reformare*) all things in a most complete way (*perfectissime*). For it is fitting that the most perfect principle not forsake (*dimittere*) his work just short of completion (*citra perfectum*). Thus, the reparative principle (*reparatorium principium*) of human redemption should bring the remedy to completion (*ad perfectum*).[63]

A key premise here is that Christ, the principle of reparation, should carry out the remedy to completion. In other words, if the Incarnate Word—the reparative principle—is to reform *perfectissime*, then he must descend into hell, resurrect on the third day, ascend to the right hand of the Father, and send the Holy Spirit.

Christ thus brings the remedy of human redemption to ultimate completion when he sends the Holy Spirit. *Reparatio*, which involves

---

[60] *Sermo 43*, §1 (*SD*:426). Bonaventure is here applying a spiritual interpretation to Christ's healing of a sick man (Lk 14:4).
[61] Cf. 2 Cor 3:17; Gal 5:11.
[62] *Brev.*, 5.10.1 (5:250b-251a).
[63] *Brev.*, 4.10.2 (5:251a).

reforming the human person who, though created "spiritual," had on account of sin become "carnal, animal, and sensual,"[64] culminates in the gift of the Spirit to humanity. In effect, the gift of mutual Love un-bends the human person bent over (*incurvatus*) through sin.

Bonaventure continues, holding that the work of the reparative principle—if it is to be *perfectissimum*—must therefore be "most sufficient" and "most efficacious." The remedy is "most sufficient" insofar as it extends to the "heavenly," "terrestrial," and "infernal" spheres:

- after the Passion, he "descended into hell to liberate (*ad liberandum*) those detained in hell (*in inferno*)";
- he then "resurrected from the dead to bring to life (*ad vivificandum*) those dead in sin";
- he ascended into heaven, leading back (*reducendo*) those captive, to revive (*ad redintegrandum*) the heavenly Jerusalem.[65]

Where is the Holy Spirit? Bonaventure adds that Christ "sent the Holy Spirit to build up (*ad aedificandum*) the terrestrial Jerusalem."[66] The most sufficient embrace of reparation extends into the life of the Church built up by the Spirit on earth. For the *reparatio* of humans to be most sufficient, Bonaventure asserts that all of these things are necessary. Christ's most sufficient *reparatio* involves the ecclesial mission of the Holy Spirit.

While the remedy, as "most sufficient," is "cosmic" in terms of "space," so the remedy is "most efficicacious" in terms of "time."[67] It embraces those who came before and those who come after Christ. Bonaventure is referring to all those who were and who are Christ's members through faith, hope, and charity. With respect to those who came before—"who believed in the Christ, and by believing hoped, and by hoping loved"—Christ descended into hell (*in infernos*) to liberate them. With respect to those who came after, Christ resurrected in order to build up faith, and ascended to heavenly glory to raise up hope.[68] Lastly, "to enkindle charity (*ut inflammaret ad caritatem*), he sent the fire of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost." Again, his Ascension

---

[64] *Brev.*, 4.1.3 (5:241b); see n53 above.
[65] *Brev.*, 4.10.3 (5:251a).
[66] *Brev.*, 4.10.3 (5:251a).
[67] Benson, "The Christology of the *Breviloquium*," 282.
[68] *Brev.*, 4.10.5-6 (5:251b).

prepares for this Pentecost: after his Ascension, that is, his disciples—through fasting, praying, and groaning—are disposed "to receive the Holy Spirit (*ad Spiritus sancti susceptionem*)."[69]

Bonaventure then concludes with a pronounced pneumatological reflection:

> And since the Holy Spirit, who is charity and is had through charity, is the origin of all gifts (*origo charismatum*), therefore, when the Holy Spirit descends, the fullness of gifts is poured out so as to bring to consummation the Mystical Body of Christ (*ad corpus Christi mysticum consummandum*).[70]

The mission of the Incarnate Word, of he who is the *perfectio universi* and *fructus* of creation, culminates pentecostally in the Spirit who builds the "terrestrial Jerusalem" and ultimately consummates it.[71] Consequently, the fulfillment of creation—which lies in the Incarnation—*thus* lies also in the ecclesial and salvific mission of the Holy Spirit.

Furthermore, when Christ sends the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, the pneumatic finality of his own mission takes on an especially ecclesial texture. In this regard, Fehlner is exactly correct when he states: "The mission of the Son *ad extra* involves, then, not only the assumption of an individual human nature, but the incorporation of the elect into his mystical body."[72] *Therefore*, the mission of the Son implicates the mission of the Spirit, because the Spirit builds up the Church and brings it to ultimate consummation. The mission of the Spirit is thus enfolded within the structure and aim of the mission of the Son. Through the Spirit, incorporation into the Body formally takes place.[73]

---

[69] *Brev.*, 4.10.7 (5:251b).

[70] *Brev.*, 4.10.8 (5:252a).

[71] Regarding Christ as *perfectio universi*, see *Brev.*, 4.4.4 (5:244b); Bonaventure calls the Incarnation the *complementum universi* at *Brev.*, 4.3.5 (5:243a). See also *III Sent.*, d. 1, a. 2, q. 1, fund. 2 and resp. (3:19a and 20ab). Regarding Christ as *fructus* of creation, see my earlier engagement with Benson's study in Section 2.2.2 of the previous chapter.

[72] Fehlner, *The Role of Charity*, 56. Or as he puts it later: "The mission of the Son is begun in the incarnation, but completed in the formation of his mystical body and in the incorporation of the members of that body" (76).

[73] "Again, the Holy Spirit is given to unite and bind together (*ad uniendum et colligandum*) the members of the Mystical Body; but the members of the Mystical Body are members united to one another (*invicem unita*), as the Lord himself prays in John 17: 'That they may be consummated into one (*ut sint consummati in unum*)' [v. 23]." *I Sent.*, d. 14, a. 2, q. 1, fund. 4 (1:249a). See also Fehlner, *The Role of Charity*, 41; Ennis, "The Place of Love," 142-143.

"The degree to which the Spirit is found within the Christian," to quote Fehlner once more, "is directly proportionate to the manner in which the Christian is incorporated into the body of Christ."[74]

Bonaventure's remark *ad corpus Christi mysticum consummandum* also prepares the reader for *Breviloquium* 5. Therein, in Part 5, Bonaventure makes a further reference to the mystery of the Church's consummation through charity. The Holy Spirit, who builds up the Body of Christ, draws men and women into this Body, "which contains in it the entirety of those to be saved (*universitatem in se continet salvandorum*)." This ecclesial unity begins *in via*, but is "consummated (*consummatur*) in eternal glory, according to what the Lord prays: 'that they may be one, just as we are one; and I in them, and you in me, that they may be consummated into one' [Jn 17:22-23]; this unity is consummated *per vinculum caritatis*."[75] Christ's prayer in John 17 is a prayer for the Holy Spirit, the *unitas caritatis*.[76] The charity of the Spirit, formative of the unity of Christ's Body, brings it to consummation in eternal glory. In effect, the unity of the Church—which Bonaventure will also refer to explicitly as a *unitas caritatis*[77]—is consummated through the *unitas caritatis* that is the Holy Spirit. Christ's *reparatio* prepares for the ecclesial and salvific mission of the Spirit.

Pilgriming ever deeper into unity consummated in "eternal glory" by the Spirit, *nexus/unitas* of the Father and Son, Christian life manifests itself ecclesially as a "we." Christianity reveals that the ontological "ego" of the self thereby enters into the fullness of "spiritual"—in contradistinction to the limitations of a merely carnal— existence only within the context of charity's communal structure: the "I" blossoms salvifically only within the context of the ecclesial "we."[78] The existential weight of being—both the "existential anxiety" of creaturely existence as such, as well as the more grave anxiety experienced as the "loneliness" and "isolation" induced by sin—is made light in the Body of Christ.[79] This ecclesiology stands in stark contrast to the

---

[74] Fehlner, *The Role of Charity*, 90-91.

[75] *Brev.*, 5.8.4 (5:262a)

[76] See Section 3.3 in Part One, Chapter Three above.

[77] *Perf. evang.*, q. 4, a. 1, ad 6 (5:182b).

[78] See Fehlner, *The Role of Charity*, 167.

[79] I am taking the terms "existential anxiety," "isolation," and "loneliness" from Piet Schoonenberg, *Man and Sin: A Theological View*, trans. J. Donceel (Notre Dame: University

pathological need for autonomy so characteristic of modern ideological platforms that, for example, champion abortion for the sake of bodily autonomy.

Breviloquium 4's conclusion unveils Bonaventure's Christocentrism as ultimately heterotelic. Its end is quite literally "other" than Christ, yet inseparable from Christ. That is to say, the centrality of Christ culminates in mediation—in the Spirit whom he sends. To conclude with Fehlner: "The *Trinitas oeconomica* in the creation of God, that has its origins in the divine missions, finds its formal consummation in charity."[80]

2. Christian Life in the Spirit: The Pneumatic Form of Christianity

In the previous section, I attended to Christ's mission in regards to its pneumatic finality: *Christus ascendit, Spiritus sanctus descendit*. Christ sets us free in the mission of the Spirit.[81] He liberates us so that the Spirit, who is charity, might take us home *ad patria*.[82] Christian life itself thus takes on a pneumatic form: it is life in the Spirit, life animated by the Spirit.[83] To be a Christian means living in the freedom and love of the Holy Spirit whom Christ sent.

I now unpack and develop this theology further.[84] To do so I consider two aspects that define the basic lineaments of Christian existence. The first

---

of Notre Dame, 1965), especially 90-96. "Loneliness may also derive from my inability to step outside of myself in love. That is loneliness as a product of sin …. Insofar as it follows upon the very fact that we are creatures, existential anxiety is an anxiety for an emptiness which may be filled; whereas the anxiety deriving from sin makes us face emptiness as such. The creature's anxiety comes from a loneliness which may be fertile; the sinner's anxiety comes from isolation" (91 and 96).

[80] Fehlner, *The Role of Charity*, 141.

[81] See n60 above.

[82] See n15 above.

[83] In his *Jesus of Nazareth*, Part 2, *Holy Week: From the Entrance Into Jerusalem to the Resurrection*, trans. Vatican Secretariat of State (San Francisco: Ignatius, 2011), Pope Benedict XVI similarly noted the connection between Ascension and the Holy Spirit and arrived at a significant conclusion: "The content of the Christian life … [is] gift of the Holy Spirit" (286). He does not, however, develop this point much further. In effect, this section of the present study thus develops Benedict's point from a specifically bonaventurean perspective.

[84] In my "The Center Blossoms, Part 1," I attend specifically to the interrelation between *Breviloquium* Parts 4-6. With permission from the editor of *Franciscan Studies*, I have incorporated select phrases and passages from that publication in the present and successive section of this study.

aspect is *reparatio*. I choose this aspect because Bonaventure identifies Christ as the *principium reparativum* who repairs us (*reparat nos*). The second aspect is *adoptio*, which Bonaventure understands as the fruit of *reparatio*.[85] These two key doctrines that pertain to the very shape of Christian life receive in Bonaventure a certain "pneumatic form." They shed further light on the pneumatic finality of Christ's mission.

My analysis of Bonaventure's theology of *reparatio* will focus primarily, though not exclusively, on the synthesis of the *Breviloquium*, given that the Christology therein revolves around the notion of *reparatio*. In treating his theology of *adoptio*, however, I shift focus to his *Commentarius in Librum Sententiarum*, as it offers a more substantial reflection on this notion.

2.1 *Bonaventure's Theology of Reparatio*

Christ is the *principium reparativum* who brings about the *reparatio* of the human race. In *Breviloquium* 4, every chapter includes at least one reference to the *reparatio* of the human race or to Christ as *principium reparativum*. The notion of *reparatio* thus constitutes a key Christological category for the Seraphic Doctor. In fact, as Begasse has noted, Bonaventure tends to choose this term rather than "redemption" whenever Scripture or Tradition does not require the latter.[86] The term *reparatio*, "which comes from Leo the Great, belongs to the semantic field of re-creation/restoration, and thereby establishes a relation between creation and salvation. It consists in repairing the damage that has befallen humanity corrupted by sin, as a new creation (*nuovo plasmare*)."[87] Etymologically, the term simply means: to prepare anew (*re-parare*). Christ prepares humanity anew.

This nuance implies that Christian life is not simply about "being redeemed" in a merely forensic manner. That could lead to a conception of

---

[85] In effect, then, this section constitutes a study of Bonaventure's theology of *reparatio*.

[86] Begasse de Dhaem, "Il *triplex verbum* bonaventuriano," 341-342. It is not the case, however, that Bonaventure does not use the term "redemption." He makes no such argument, for example, that it is an inappropriate or insufficient term. Indeed, Bonaventure still uses the term, even if *reparatio* is a more prominent category in his theology.

[87] Begasse de Dhaem, "Il *triplex verbum* bonaventuriano," 342.

Christian life ultimately divorced from the daily drama of human existence with its trials, engagements, decisions, difficulties, and so forth. To be prepared anew, however, does not entail that the salvific journey of Christian life is somehow already complete. It rather emphasizes that the journey is now possible.

Furthermore, *reparatio* understood in terms of "preparation" is not meant to downgrade or minimize the significance of Christ's mission. Rather, this theological perspective accents the intrinsic relation between the salvific missions of Christ and the Spirit. In other words, to highlight the preparatory dimension of *reparatio* does not diminish, but draws attention to the fullness of what Christ makes possible. As alluded to already, Christ's liberating mission anticipates the nourishing mission of the Holy Spirit; Christ ascends, and in so doing prepares for the reception of the Holy Spirit and thus for love that is entirely spiritual. Accordingly, as will be unpacked below, *reparatio*'s pneumatological reverberation does not undermine Christ, but accentuates his own fontality and the fruitfulness of his own mission.

2.1.1 *Breviloquium* Part 4: The Pneumatological Undertone of Christ's *Reparatio*

This dynamic conception of *reparatio*—in terms of a new preparation—begins to surface in the very opening of *Breviloquium* 4. Bonaventure says that the Incarnation of the Word is for the "*salus* and *reparatio* of the human race."[88] Yet, while the term *reparatio*—including reference to Christ as *principium reparativum*—drenches Part 4, *salus* does not. In fact, after this initial reference, it hardly appears. *Salus*, however, plays a major role in Part 5 (grace of the Holy Spirit) and Part 6 (sacraments). In a word, grace prepares the human person *ad salutem*, and the "fruit" of the sacraments is the *salus* of the human person.[89] Therefore, although Bonaventure's explicit treatment of Christ formally ends in Part 4, Christ's mission—inasmuch as it pertains to the "*salus* and *reparatio* of the human race"—continues in the grace of the Spirit he sent and in the sacraments of

---

[88] *Brev.*, 4.1.1 (5:241a).
[89] *Brev.*, 5.2.2 (5:253b) and 6.1.6 (5:265b-266a).

the Church which mediate encounter with and reception of the Spirit. *Reparatio*, understood in terms of preparing anew, effects openness to *salus*—and so ultimately to the Holy Spirit. Bonaventure's medicinal language captures well this framework: The physician—Christ—prepares the sick person for health by prescribing, as it were, the medicine of the Holy Spirit, which brings about "the perfect cure, which will be in glory."[90] Christ is savior as *medicus*—which entails the *medicina* that is the grace of the Holy Spirit. As savior, Christ liberates humanity from the disease of sin that we might live freely in the Holy Spirit—"because where [there is] the Spirit of the Lord, there is freedom"[91] (2 Cor 3:17)—and thus enter into the fullness of *salus*.

Bonaventure's theology of Pentecost, as articulated in one of his Pentecost sermons, corroborates this connection between *salus* and the Holy Spirit. He teaches that the Holy Spirit has three properties, and that these three properties correspond to a threefold gift, "in which the entirety of today's blessing … consists."[92] These three properties are "infallible truth, generous charity, and insuperable power." "And these three," Bonaventure states, "are necessary *ad salutem* of every condition, sex, and age." The *status salutis* depends, in other words, on the pentecostal descent and gift of the Holy Spirit. Bonaventure thereby perceives Pentecost as fundamentally linked to the mystery of *salus*.

What of the specific content of *reparatio*? In the *Breviloquium*, Bonaventure explains that the *principium reparativum* remedies, makes satisfaction, and reconciles.[93] Especially relevant here is the last aspect: reconciliation. Bonaventure's theology of reconciliation centers on Christ as mediator.[94] As Mediator, Christ is the "*medium* between God and man." In this way, he leads humanity to knowledge of God, conformity with God, and to a filial relationship with God (*ad reducendum hominem ad divinam cognitionem, ad divinam conformitatem et ad divinam filiationem*).[95]

---

[90] *Brev.*, 1.1.2 (5:210a). See also *I Sent.*, d. 14, dub. 3 (1:254a); n12 above.

[91] See n60 above; Bonaventure is here citing 2 Cor 3:17.

[92] *Sermo 27*, §3 (*SD*:321).

[93] *Brev.*, 4.2.6 (5:243a).

[94] To effect reconciliation is what it means to be "Mediator." See also *III Sent.*, d. 1, a. 2, q. 1, fund. 5 (3:19b) and d.19, a. 2, q. 2, resp. (3:410b).

[95] *Brev.*, 4.2.6 (5:243a).

Bonaventure's analysis of these three objectives of reconciliation underscores the utmost fittingness that the second divine person, the *medium*—the Word, Image, and Son—became incarnate. His explicit treatment here does not discuss the Holy Spirit but focuses on Christ as:

- Word (→ knowledge),
- Image (→ conformity), and
- Son (→ adoption).[96]

Though the emphasis is manifestly Christological, when read within Bonaventure's theological vision as a whole, a clear though implicit pneumatological nuance also surfaces:

- Regarding knowledge of God: the Holy Spirit is *doctor*. In a sermon on Pentecost, Bonaventure says that in the Holy Spirit there is the "highest truth." Appealing, then, to John 16:13 ("the Spirit of truth"), Bonaventure goes on to say that the Spirit—*summus et fontalissimus doctor*—"illuminated [the Apostles] so perfectly and excellently … that their understanding … was elevated to the knowledge and speculation of the deity."[97]
- Regarding conformity with God: grace, with and in which is given the Uncreated Gift of the Holy Spirit and "through which we are a home and dwelling place of the Holy Spirit,"[98] conforms us to the Holy Trinity.[99]
- Regarding our adoptive filiation: this is, as will be discussed in more detail below, consummated in the Holy Spirit.[100]

A stronger connection to the Holy Spirit emerges when Bonaventure proffers a definition of *reparatio*. He defines *reparatio* as a work (*operatio*) of God that involves a twofold movement: "it flows (*manat*) from him [the First Principle] according to generosity (*liberalitatem*) and it returns to him (*reducit*) according to conformity (*conformitatem*)."[101] The fullness of *reparatio* involves both elements. The origin and goal of *reparatio* is God. It

---

[96] See also *III Sent.*, d. 1, a. 2, q. 3, resp. (3:29a-30a).

[97] *Sermo 27*, §4 (*SD*:322). See also *I Sent.*, d. 16, au., q. 3, resp. (1:283b-284a); and *Sermo 25* (*SD*:309-314), wherein Bonaventure refers to the Holy Spirit as *magister totius sapientiae* (§2 [*SD*:310]); see also Melone's analysis of *Sermo 25* in her "Lo Spirito, dono di carità," 68-72.

[98] *Sermo 1*, §14 (*SD*: 138).

[99] See also *II Sent.*, d. 26, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (2:635a-636a); *Brev.*, 5.1.3 (5:252b-252a); *Sermo 27*, §3 (*SD*: 322).

[100] See Section 2.2 below.

[101] *Brev.*, 4.5.3 (4:245b).

is not our work, but God's. *Reparatio* originates from God, and it prepares us for our *reductio*, our return to God.

Bonaventure continues: "*Therefore*, it is necessary that this [i.e., this twofold dynamic of flowing from and returning to] obtains (*fiat*) through grace and deiformity (*per gratiam et deiformitatem*)."[102] In other words, the specific structure of *reparatio* links it to grace and deiformity. Grace and deiformity unfold *reparatio*. Ultimately, though, the human journey into God-conforming likeness—deiformity—is itself wedded to the mystery of grace. Bonaventue can thus tighten his explanation: grace encompasses *reparatio*'s dynamic twofold movement as a whole, since grace "flows forth from God generously (*manat a Deo liberaliter*)" and renders man "deiformem."[103] Accordingly, the "*reparativum principium* [= Christ] repairs (*reparat*) us through grace."[104] In a word, then, the mystery of *reparatio* is enfolded within the mystery of grace which flows generously from God and leads back to God by effecting a certain God-conforming likeness (*deiformitas*).[105]

The emphasis on grace makes Bonaventure's theology of *reparatio* pulsate pneumatologically. It prepares the reader for *Breviloquium* Part 5: *De gratia Spiritus sancti*. Before, however, turning to Part 5, two aspects of this synthesis deserve further comment: the notion of deiformity and the ecclesiological context.

2.1.2 Deiformity and the Holy Spirit

The key point to grasp here is that charity—inseparable from sanctifying grace—makes us deiform.[106] As Bonaventure explicitly states:

---

[102] *Brev.*, 4.5.3 (5:245b), emphasis mine.

[103] *Brev.*, 4.5.3 (5:245b).

[104] *Brev.*, 4.5.3 (5:245b). See also *Brev*, 4.6.2 (5:246b): "sicut reparativi principii est nos reparare per liberalissimam gratiam …"; and 4.6.6 (5:247a): "gratia maxime respicit opus reparationis."

[105] See also *In Ioann.*, 7.56 (6:350a): "Grace is rightly called a flowing river (*flumen fluens*) …. It flows (*fluit*) from God and makes man flow back (*refluere*) into God."

[106] On grace and charity as inseparable, see *I Sent.*, d. 15, p. 2, au., q. 1, fund. 1 (1:270a); *I Sent.*, d. 17, p. 1, au., q. 3, resp. (1:299a); *I Sent.*, d. 17, p. 1, dub. 3 (1:305a). Regarding the link between charity and *deiformitas*, see Melone, "Lo Spirito, dono di carità," 61-64 and *Idem*, "*Spiritus sanctus facit nos similes*," 139-141.

[charity] makes us maximally (*maxime*) deiform …. Just as the Father and the Son are connected (*nectuntur*) by a nexus of love (*nexu amoris*) and are united, so man, by adhering to God through charity, becomes (*efficitur*) one spirit. Thus it is said in John 17: 'That they may be consummated as one, just as we are one' [v. 22-23]."[107]

Significantly, moreover, this study has already noted the pneumatological undertone of Christ's prayer in John 17. Bonaventure appeals to this prayer for the Holy Spirit as a confirmation of his stance on charity. Furthermore, in addition to specifying charity's role, Bonaventure's words also underscore what deiformity consists of: it involves a kind of sharing in the intimacy of triune life, in virtue of that life's own loving *nexus*. "The *reducere* of creation," writes Hellmann, "is completed in the same *uno nexu* of the Spirit uniting the Father and the Son."[108] Ultimately, because charity renders human life deiform, the Seraphic Doctor teaches that the whole "spiritual edifice" of spiritual life itself is consummated in charity.[109] I cannot help but to recall the *Breviloquium*'s treatment of Pentecost: Christ sent the Holy Spirit *qui caritas est*.[110] Bonaventure's theology of charity imbues spiritual life with a pneumatic—pentecostal—form.

Enfolded within the passage from John 17:22 quoted above is what one might call the specificity of the Holy Spirit's role in "the salvific project of God."[111] Bonaventure states:

The Holy Spirit, existing and dwelling in us, makes us similar (*facit nos similes*) to that most high (*summae*) Trinity, just as the Lord says in John 17: "That they may be one, as we are" [v. 22]. But the Holy Spirit, in us existing, produces first the love of charity. According to Romans 5: "The love (*caritas*) of God is poured in our hearts [through the Holy Spirit, who was given to us]" [v. 5].[112]

---

[107] *III Sent.*, d. 27, a. 2, q. 1, resp. (3:604a).

[108] Hellmann, *Divine and Created Order*, 182 (quoted also at n44 in the previous chapter). See also Fehlner, *The Role of Charity*, 122-131.

[109] *III Sent.*, d. 27, a. 2, q. 1, ad 6 (3:604a).

[110] I do not want to conflate the distinction between created and uncreated charity (the Holy Spirit)—see *I Sent.*, d. 17, p. 1, au., q. 1 (1:292-296). Yet, as Fehlner (*The Role of Charity*, 125) also argues: "the created gift of charity … is included with the uncreated gift as its *immediate disposition*" (emphasis mine).

[111] Melone, "*Spiritus sanctus facit nos similes*," 139.

[112] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 2, fund. 4 (1:197a).

Commenting on this passage, Melone identifies two fundamental dimensions of the Spirit's role in the economy. First, the Holy Spirit is an agent of *communio*: "of rendering us *unum* as the Father and the Son are in him." Second, the Holy Spirit accomplishes this by "the effusion of charity into our hearts."[113] Bonaventure synthesizes Johannine and Pauline pneumatology—Christ's prayer and Paul's experience.

In effect, the charity poured into our hearts is the engine of the spiritual life: "the whole spiritual machine (*spiritualis machina*) [has its life] from love (*ab amore*)."[114] Christian existence grows as it is nourished by and matures in the love of the Spirit. "Love is a vivifying act, because love is life."[115] Without charity, the heart is empty—like a meal without bread.[116]

Ultimately, charity is inseparable from the Holy Spirit.[117] Hence, the Holy Spirit emerges as the key protagonist of human deiformation. The "fundamental salvific task assigned to the Spirit," to quote Melone, is "to render us *deiformes*."[118] Accordingly, the Christian journey to *deiformitas*—and thus our *reductio*—is realized in the Holy Spirit.[119] In this way, the *reductio* of *reparatio* thus manifests pneumatic finality, insofar as the charity of the Spirit draws us into the depths of Trinitarian life. The unitive love within the Trinity is that same love that conforms us to the Trinity, that makes us deiform, that connects us to the Father and Son.[120] *Reparatio*, inasmuch as it involves leading us back to God "through deiformity," finds its own consummation in the mission of the Holy Spirit. The consummation of *reparatio* thereby converges with the consummation of the "spiritual edifice" of human life in charity.

---

[113] Melone, "*Spiritus sanctus facit nos similes*," 139.

[114] *I Sent.*, d. 14, dub. 6 (255a). The context of this *dubium* is Romans 5:5. See also *I Sent.*, d. 17, p. 1, au., q. 1, fund. 3 (1:293a): "caritas est principium vivendi."

[115] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 3, resp. (1:204ab)—see my discussion of Bonaventure's theology of *spiritus* as a proper name of the Holy Spirit in Section 2.1.2.4 in Part 1, Chapter 3.

[116] *In Luc.*, 11.31 (7:286b).

[117] See, e.g., *I Sent.*, d. 18, a. 1, q. 1, resp. (1:323a); *In Ioann.*, 20.53 (6:515b).

[118] Melone, "*Spiritus sanctus facit nos similes*," 141.

[119] "È proprio mediante un vissuto di carità … che l'uomo, redento da Cristo, riacquista la sua somiglianza con Dio, la sua *deiformitas* …. Tale vissuto di carità è sostenuto e reso possibile soltanto dal dono e dalla presenza dello Spirito. … [P]er il Dottore serafico, infatti, l'influsso deiforme si attua nello Spirito, richiede il suo rendersi presente nell'esistenza umana redenta." Melone, "Lo Spirito, dono di carità," 62.

[120] See *Don. Spir.*, 1.7 (5:458b).

2.1.3 *Influentia*: The Ecclesiological Context of *Reparatio*

Because the mystery of *reparatio* unfolds "through grace," so "in our reparative principle, namely Christ our Lord, there was every fullness of grace."[121] In this way Bonaventure links his theology of *reparatio* to Christ's threefold grace: the grace of headship, of the singular person, and of union.[122] Relevant here is Christ's grace of headship. The grace, through which *reparatio* unfolds, is mediated to the members of Christ's ecclesial Body by Christ as Head of the Body. From Christ the Head, the Mystical Body receives the "influence of motion and sense (*influentiam motus et sensus*)."[123] By this *influentia*, Christ causes "in us faith and love (*fidem et dilectionem*)."[124]

The theologically rich notion of *influentia* permeates various spheres of Bonaventure's theology and is especially pertinent to his theology of grace and hierarchy.[125] It is not here necessary, however, to proffer a thorough treatment. Rather I focus specifically on its pneumatological import. That there is at least some implicit connection to the Holy Spirit is clear simply in light of the term's connection to Bonaventure's theology of grace, which he defines as a certain *influentia*.

To shed light on the pneumatological nuance of *influentia*, I turn first to Bonaventure's theology of the temporal procession of the Holy Spirit. As discussed in Part 1, Chapter 3 of this study, the framework of procession is *ab alio in alium*. In God, the Holy Spirit proceeds *in alium sicut in obiectum*. The temporal procession of the Holy Spirit, however, is different, namely, *in alium sicut in susceptivum*. "Reception of the Holy Spirit" in this way "is

---

[121] *Brev.*, 4.5.3 (5:245b).

[122] Regarding this triple distinction, see Hayes, *The Hidden Center*, 97-102.

[123] *Brev.*, 4.5.5 (5:246a).

[124] *III Sent.*, d. 13, a. 2, q. 3, resp. (3:289b). As Bonaventure explains in this response, "sensus" corresponds to knowledge and "motion" to affection and love.

[125] On this topic, see Shelby's *Spiraling Into God*; especially helpful for this part of the present study was Chapter 4, "The *Influentia* of Sanctifying Grace in *The Commentary on the Sentences* and the *Breviloquium*," 122-164. See also Francisco Martínez Fresneda, "Influentia," in *Dizionario Bonaventuriano*, 492-501. Specifically with respect to "influentia sensus et motus," see Guardini, *Systembildende Elemente in der Theologie Bonaventuras* (Leiden: Brill, 1964), 125-145. On Christ's headship, in addition to Hayes (n122 above), see Fehlner, *The Role of Charity*, 58-61; for a more pneumatological perspective of Christ's headship, see Angelina Magdalena Zamora, *Ecclesiological Elements in the Theology of St. Bonaventure* (Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2020), 223-228.

through the influence (*influentiam*) of gratuitous gifts (*doni gratuiti*)."[126] Grace is that "in which is given the Holy Spirit."[127] The term *influentia* thereby indicates, as Shelby highlights, "that through which the uncreated gift of grace is given. Notably, this *influentia* is not God, but it is the means through which God—the Holy Spirit, the uncreated gift of grace—dwells in the soul that consents to receive it."[128]

Furthermore, in his specific treatment of Christ's grace of headship, Bonaventure argues that it entails both uncreated and created grace. Christ, as "Head," must exhibit three characteristics—which come from the corporeal conception of what a head is. As Hayes summarizes: "In a physical sense, the qualities of the head are principally the following: (1) the head is like the members of the body; (2) the head is the principle of the members; and (3) the head is the source of influence for sense and motion."[129] Accordingly, Christ must be conformed to the members of the Body, be the principle of the members of the Body, and influence the sense and motion of the members of the Body. In virtue of Christ's humanity, there is conformity. In virtue of Christ's divinity, he is principle. But in virtue of both his humanity and divinity, he influences. Influencing grace, Bonaventure explains, can be distinguished: through the mode of the one preparing (*per modum praeparantis*) or through the mode of the one imparting (*per modum impartientis*). The former corresponds to Christ's humanity and the latter to his divinity.[130] Thus, "in one way, [to influence motion and sense in the members] designates uncreated grace, but in another way it does not designate uncreated grace, but rather created."[131] Christ influences through both the created gift of grace and the uncreated gift that is the Holy Spirit.

---

[126] *I Sent.*, d. 14, a. 1, q. 1, resp. (1:246a).

[127] *I Sent.*, d. 14, a. 1, q. 1, ad 3 (1:246a).

[128] Shelby, *Spiraling Into God*, 132.

[129] Hayes, *The Hidden Center*, 99.

[130] "If through the mode of the one preparing, then it is according (*ratione*) to the human nature of Christ himself, in which he suffered on our behalf and by suffering he satisfied and removed enmity, and disposed [us] to receive (*ad suscipiendam*) perfect grace. If through the mode of the one imparting and conferring, then it is according (*ratione*) to the divine nature of Christ himself, who 'alone is God, who illuminates pious minds [*pias mentes*],' who is he alone who baptizes interiorly (*interius*), because (*pro eo quod*) 'our mind is immediately formed by that Truth,' as Augustine often says." *III Sent.*, d. 13, a. 2, q. 1, resp. (3:284b).

[131] *III Sent.*, d. 13, a. 2, q. 1, resp. (3:285a).

Even more explicit in this regard, though, is the parallel developed by Bonaventure between the grace of Christ's hypostatic union and the grace of headship.[132] Regarding the grace of the hypostatic union, Bonaventure distinguishes between:

1) the grace that prepares the human soul for the union,
2) the grace that effects the hypostatic union, and
3) the grace of the union itself.

This threefold structure does not connote a kind of chronological sequence that resulted in the hypostatic union. It is not that Jesus was first made ready for union and then later became divine. This threefold distinction rather betrays a certain logic that describes the event of the union itself. The hypostatic union would not be possible in the case of a soul without grace rendering the soul fitting (*congrua*) for such union. This grace prepares for effective grace (*gratia effectiva*), which brings about the union between the human soul of Christ and the Word. And finally there is the grace of the union itself (*unio gratuita*).

The relevant piece here is the grace that effects the union. Though it designates the divine essence insofar as the Incarnation is the work of the whole Trinity, it is appropriated to the Holy Spirit.[133]

Regarding the grace of Christ's headship, in a similar way Bonaventure distinguishes between:

1) the grace that prepares for the *influentiam motus et sensus*,
2) that which is the effective principle (*principium effectivum*) of the sense and motion of Christ's members, and
3) the gratuitousness of Christ's headship itself (*gratuita praesidentia*).

That is, preparative grace refers to that by which Christ merited for us, and so prepares us for the *influentiam motus et sensus*. The effective principle refers to that which brings about such influence. And finally, there is the grace of Christ's headship in itself, his *gratuita praesidentia*.

---

[132] See *III Sent.*, d. 13, a. 2, q. 2, resp. (3:287ab); *III Sent.*, d. 2, a. 3, q. 2, ad 6 (3:53b); Zamora, *Ecclesiological Elements*, 224-226.

[133] See *III Sent.*, d. 2, a. 3, q. 3, resp. (3:55ab); *Brev.*, 4.3 (243a-244a);

Again, it is the second piece that is here relevant. The effective principle "designates God himself, and by appropriation the Holy Spirit."[134] As Zamora summarily states: "Hence it is that Bonaventure appropriates the unitive work in both the Incarnation and the Church to the Holy Spirit."[135] Christ's *influentia* "is brought about by and in the Holy Spirit."[136]

In his later *Hexaemeron*, Bonaventure makes even more explicit this pneumatological dimension of Christ's Headship: Christ is "Head," because "from him flow all spiritual sense and motion (*sensus et motus spirituales*) and gifts of graces (*charismata gratiarum*). … He therefore pours out (*diffundit*) the Holy Spirit in the members of the Church united to him (*sibi unita*)."[137] Christ as Head is truly, to refer to an expression quoted earlier, "giver of the Holy Spirit." Fitting words from one of Bonaventure's sermons on St. Agnes come to mind:

> But to what should the spouse open [her heart]? Surely, to the reception (*ad susceptionem*) of the grace of the Holy Spirit. But from where is had this fullness (*plenitudo*)? Surely from Christ who is the "head full of dew" [Cant 5:2]. The head is one member and has many members; in a similar way, Christ is one, but multiform in virtue. Open therefore [your] mouth and desire to Christ, that (*ut*) you may draw in (*attrahas*) the Holy Spirit, because "his head is full of dew," through which we understand the gifts of divine graces (*charismata gratiarum divinarum*).[138]

In a word, precisely because Christian existence is Christic in form, it is thereby ecclesial and thus ultimately pneumatic. Within the Church—the Body of salvation en route to "eternal glory"—Christian life is nourished and animated by the *influentia Christi*, which entails reception of the gift of the Holy Spirit for which Christ himself prayed: "that they may be one, just as we are" (Jn 17:22).

2.1.4 *Breviloquium* Part 5: The Pneumatic Form of *Reparatio*

---

[134] *III Sent.*, d. 13, a. 2, q. 2, resp. (3:287a).
[135] Zamora, *Ecclesiological Elements*, 226.
[136] Zamora, *Ecclesiological Elements*, 224.
[137] *Hex.*, 1.20 (5:332b).
[138] *Sermo 38,* §6 (*SDD* 2:512-513).

To complete this section on Bonaventure's theology of *reparatio*, I now turn to *Breviloquium* Part 5: *De gratia Spiritus sancti*. Especially in its first chapter, Part 5 makes this pneumatological thrust of Bonaventure's Christocentrism clear. It illuminates the pneumatic finality of *reparatio*, to which I now attend.

Bonaventure opens his treatment affirming that the Incarnate Word is the "origin and fount (*origo et fons*) of every gratuitous gift (*omnis doni gratuiti*)."[139] Fontality describes the centrality of Christ. Part 4's pentecostal conclusion thus anticipates Part 5's opening. Indeed, each part highlights the pneumatological thrust of Christ's mission: Part 4 concludes by alluding to the Spirit as culmination and Part 5 begins by referring to Christ as origin.

In his opening discussion of grace in Part 5, Bonaventure accentuates the link between the created gift of grace and the uncreated gift that is the Holy Spirit.

> [Grace] is the gift (*donum*), which is given and poured out (*donatur et infunditur*) directly (*immediate*) by God. And with it and in it (*cum ipsa et in ipsa*) is given the Holy Spirit, who is the uncreated, best and perfect gift, who descends from the Father of lights through the Word Incarnate, according to John in the Book of Revelation, [who] saw "a splendid river flowing like crystal from the seat of God and the Lamb" [Rev 22:1].[140]

Therefore, with the created gift of grace is given the uncreated gift that is the Holy Spirit. Two preliminary observations: First, this passage reveals the Trinitarian structure of grace. Commenting on the above quotation, Shelby writes: "Grace descends *from* the Father of Lights, it is given *through* the Incarnate Christ, and it is the gift *with* and *in* which the uncreated gift of the Spirit is given to the soul."[141] She then applies Benson's hermeneutic of *ortus—modus/progressus—status/fructus* to this structure: "[grace] has its *ortus* in the Father of Lights, its *modus* or *progressus* through the Incarnate Word, and its *status* or *fructus* in the Holy Spirit."[142] This Trinitarian structure inevitably evinces pneumatic finality. The intrinsic order of grace's dynamic

---

[139] *Brev.*, 5.1.1 (5:252a).
[140] *Brev.*, 5.1.1 (5:252a). See also *I Sent.*, d. 14, a. 2, q. 1, resp. (1:249b-250a).
[141] Shelby, *Spiraling Into God*, 148 (emphasis in original).
[142] Shelby, *Spiraling Into God*, 148.

structure culminates in the gift not just of grace but of the perfect uncreated Gift—the Holy Spirit. The uncreated Gift perfects its created accompaniment.

Second, the citation from Revelation 22, and in particular the image of the "river" constitutes an implicit reference to the Holy Spirit. Bonaventure makes the reference explicit in a sermon on St. Andrew:

> "The angel showed me a river flowing from the seat of God and of the Lamb; and from each side [of the river] [was] the tree of life bearing 12 fruits each month" [Rev 22:1-2]. The "river proceeding from the seat of God and of the Lamb" is the Holy Spirit who proceeds from the Father and Son. "The tree of life from each side" is the Word Incarnate, who is uncreated according to the eternal generation and created or made (*factum*) according to the temporal [generation], and yet the same in person (*in persona idem*). The uncreated Word is the origin of all creatures .... But the Incarnate Word in time (*temporaliter*) is the origin of reparation (*origo reparationis*) of all. And each work is irrigated (*irrigantur*) through the power of the Holy Spirit. The former (*ista*), namely creation, is conserved (*conservantur*), and the latter (*illa*), namely the works repaired (*opera reparata*), is advanced (*meliorantur*).[143]

In addition to making explicit the reference to the Holy Spirit from the Book Revelation, the passage also ties Christ's work of *reparatio* to the Holy Spirit. As "origin of reparation," Christ's reparative mission does not bypass, but rather anticipates the mission of the Holy Spirit who "irrigates" or "waters" what Christ *reparat*. The Holy Spirit "advances" or "improves" the work of *reparatio* by unfolding it and bringing it to fruition in the life of the faithful. *Reparatio*'s Christic origin looks to the Spirit.

This theological insight should not be overlooked. The Messiah does not conclude salvation history. As *origo reparationis*, Christ constitutes more of a "plot twist" than a "climax." "Reparation" does not resolve simply by rectifying all of the wrongs and evils in the world—which still exist in a world full of iniquity. But it does change the course of history. The *origo reparationis* prepares for the intimacy of love by *preparing anew* nature for its heavenly beatitude. In this sense, the catastrophic effects of sin no longer have the final say: prepared anew, humanity has a way out—a way forward, a journey to undertake.

---

[143] *Sermo 34 (Collatio)*, §4 (*SDD* 2:450). See also *Hex.*, 1.38 (5:335b).

Returning to the *Breviloquium*, Bonaventure goes on to explain the reason for the doctrine of grace just expressed:

> Since the productive First Principle (*primum principium productivum*), out of its own supreme benevolence, made the rational spirit capable of eternal beatitude (*capacem beatitudinis aeternae*); and the reparative principle (*principium reparativum*) prepared anew (*reparavit*) that capacity—weakened (*infirmatam*) through sin—*ad salutem*; and eternal beatitude consists in having the highest good; and this is God …: no one at all is worthy of attaining that supreme good—since it is altogether above every limit of nature—unless elevated above oneself through God coming down (*Deo condescendente sibi*).[144]

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the human person is *beatificabilis* and *capax Dei*. Sin, however, has weakened or rendered infirm this capacity. Christ, the *principium reparativum*, attends to this infirmity. He "prepares anew" the ontological openness of human life. Specifically, Christ prepares this *capax* anew *ad salutem*. The aforementioned "way forward" I spoke of above is precisely this journey *ad salutem*: to the fullness of health.[145] This passage thus manifests the relationship between *reparatio* and *salus*. Christ is the *principium reparativum* because he *prepares* for *salus*. He prepares us for eternal beatitude, which "consists in having the supreme good; and this is God." To attain this—to have the highest good—boundaries must be overcome. Hence God must come down to lift us up.

Bonaventure continues:

> God, however, does not come down (*condescendit*) through his immutable essence (*essentiam incommutabilem*), but through *influentiam* that flows from him (*ab ipso manantem*). And the [created] spirit is not elevated above itself in terms of its local position (*per situm localem*), but through a deiform habit (*per habitum deiformem*).[146]

Bonaventure here uses the term *influentia*, introduced previously in *Breviloquium* 4, to unpack his theology of grace. This *condescensio* "through influence" makes possible the human person's *elevatio* through deiformity:

---

[144] *Brev.*, 5.1.3 (5:252b).

[145] For a reflection on the rich meaning of "salus," see my "The Center Blossoms, Part 2: The Spirit of Salvation in Bonaventure's *Breviloquium*," forthcoming in *Franciscan Studies* (2024).

[146] *Brev.*, 5.1.3 (252b-253a).

herein lies the twofold dynamic movement of *reparatio* discussed above. Again, this elevation unfolds the human person's deformation. "It is thus necessary," so Bonaventure concludes, "that the rational spirit, in order to be made worthy (*dignus*) of eternal beatitude, participate (*particeps fiat*) in deiform influence (*influentiae deiformis*)." This deiform influence conforms "the image of our mind" to the Holy Trinity and thus leads back directly to God (*immediate ad Deum reducitur*). The "image of God" thereby becomes a "likeness (*similitudo*)"—the "deiform perfection of the divine image (*divinae imaginis perfectio deiformis*)." Bonaventure calls this deiform perfection the "image of re-creation (*imago recreationis*)."[147] Furthermore, as discussed in the previous chapter, to be a likeness is to be a dwelling of the Holy Spirit; this theology of *similitudo* thus continues to manifest the pneumatic finality of the *reductio*.

The next paragraph is key:

> Again, since one who enjoys God has God (*qui fruitur Deo Deum habet*), therefore, with grace—which by its deiform character (*sua deiformitate*) disposes one to enjoy God (*ad Dei fruitionem*)—is given the uncreated Gift, which is the Holy Spirit, whom whoever has, has also God (*quod qui habet habet et Deum*).[148]

The following synthesis results. The human creature is *capax* of eternal beatitude, but this capacity was made infirm. Christ's *reparatio* attends to this infirmity: *reparavit ad salutem*. This "salus" is ultimately eternal beatitude, "which consists in having the highest good"—inaccessible without the divine *condescensio*, without the *influentia* that renders the human creature deiform. To have the highest good—God—is to enjoy God. *For this reason*, grace includes the gift of the Holy Spirit: in possessing the Holy Spirit, one possesses—i.e., enjoys—God.

And what is this enjoyment of God? Bonaventure specifies that it is the intimacy of relationship: to have—and be had—by God is to be daughter of

---

[147] *Brev.*, 5.1.3 (252b-253a).

[148] *Brev.*, 5.1.4 (5:253a). See also Bonaventure's description of grace at *Brev.*, 5.2.2 (5:253). Understood as *gratia gratis data*, grace refers to that helping grace which prepares for the reception of the Holy Spirit (*ad suscipiendum Spiritus sancti*) and thus prepares *ad salutem*. Understood most properly (*proprie*), grace is called *gratia gratum faciens*—with which is given the Holy Spirit and—"without which no one is able to merit, to progress in the good, or to arrive at eternal salvation (*ad aeternam pervenire salutem*)."

the eternal Father, spouse of Christ, and temple of the Holy Spirit.[149] The "image of recreation" is a living constellation of relationships. Herein lies the existential manifestation of grace and possession of the Holy Spirit. To have and so to enjoy God is to enter into relationship with the Holy Trinity in this intimate way. Indeed, the created person in having God is actually had by God. It is precisely this mystery for which Christ prepares us: he prepares us for grace, and ultimately to have the Holy Spirit so that we might enjoy the fullness of intimate relationality. While Adam and Eve hid themselves after sinning (see Gen 3:8-9)—a theological narrative that captures the haunting loneliness and isolation of human life—Christ's *reparatio* prepares us anew for the intimacy of *salus*, calling us out of the caves in which we hide to receive the gift of the Holy Spirit, "whom whoever has, has also God."

One further piece of the above examination deserves attention. Bonaventure had spoken of the "image of re-creation." Interestingly, Part 4 contains no explicit reference to "re-creation." The mystery of "re-creation" unfolds via the mystery of grace and the perfect gift of the Holy Spirit. In *Breviloquium* 5.3, the Seraphic Doctor identifies Christ as the *principium recreativum*. He explains that sin, which amounts to "the deformation of the image (*deformatio imaginis*) and the destruction of grace (*peremptio gratiae*)," is "as if (*quasi*) the annihilation of the existence of morals (*in esse moris*) and of the life of grace (*vitae gratuitae*)." Consequently, the human person must be "re-created in the life of grace (*recreetur in vita gratuita*)."[150] Indeed, just as the creating Trinity creates *a se*, *secundum se*, and *propter se*, so is grace given *a Deo*, *secundum Deum*, and *propter Deum*. The order that undergirds creation is fundamentally symbolic of grace.

It would be, however, incorrect to infer that re-creation is not also Christological. Indeed, for Bonaventure, Christ "repairs us (*nos reparat*)" by re-creating us.[151] This "re-creation" is ecclesial: Christ pours forth "reformative grace," which "makes us members of Christ." As members, the soul thus becomes "a spouse of Christ, temple of the Holy Spirit, and daughter of the eternal Father—all of which takes place (*quod totum fit*) through the

---

[149] See *Brev.*, 5.1.5 (1:253a).
[150] *Brev.*, 5.3.2 (5:255a).
[151] *Brev.*, 5.3.3 (5:255a).

gratuitous and condescending infusion (*gratuitam et condescensivam infusionem*) of gratuitous gift." The Trinitarian constellation of relationships emerges now specifically within an ecclesial context. The Church effectively emerges as the cocoon of *salus*, because it is the cocoon of Trinitarian relationality.[152] This soteriological ecclesiology, however, rests ultimately upon the "condescending infusion" of grace. The mystery of "re-creation" itself thus further evinces a certain pneumatic finality. Christ re-creates us through the mystery of grace poured forth into the life of the Church. This "influentia"—which entails the concurrent gift of the uncreated Gift—draws us into the intimacy of a Trinitarian constellation of relations.

To conclude, I refer to a pertinent passage from one of Bonaventure's sermons, which evinces the pneumatological culmination of re-creation. The context is Luke 7:14-16; Jesus brings to life the widow's only son who had died. When the young boy begins to speak again, the people began to glorify God (*magnificabant Deum*). Bonaventure comments that God is indeed to be glorified for the

> work of re-creation, because it is first a declaration of power (*declarativum potentiae*) in ejecting the ancient enemy; second a manifestation of wisdom (*manifestativum sapientiae*) in the relief (*relevatione*) of the prostrate man (*hominis prostrati*); third an expression of mercy (*expressivum misericordiae*) in the mission of the Holy Spirit.[153]

2.2 *Bonaventure's Theology of Adoptio*

The above section has examined the relationship between *reparatio* and the Holy Spirit. In a word, *reparatio* is not an exclusively Christological category. It evinces a certain pneumatic finality, which, consequently, sheds light on the pneumatic form of Christian life itself. I now turn to Bonaventure's theology of *adoptio* in order to continue to draw attention to the pneumatological color of Christian life itself.

---

[152] "The return of men to the Father from whom they came cannot be anything but ecclesiological, through the Church and in the Church, as the means and actualization of that pilgrimage." Fehlner, *The Role of Charity*, 179.

[153] *Sermo 42*, §10 (*SD*:423).

The notion of adoption arises at various times in *Breviloquium* 4-5. To offer a brief synthesis, as Son of the Father, it is most fitting that the second person of the Holy Trinity become man in order to bring about our own adoption as sons and daughters (*ad filiationem adoptivam*).[154] Through "influencing grace," we are made "members of Christ and temples of the Holy Spirit, and through this sons of God."[155] Christ repairs (*reparat*) us, and thereby prepares us for the gift of the Holy Spirit—thus for having and being had by God. But no one is had and loved in this way, without being "adopted as a son (*pro filio*)."[156]

To get a fuller view, however, of Bonaventure's theology of our adoption as sons, it is necessary to look at his *Commentary on the Sentences*. Therein, Bonaventure states that "the Incarnation is ordered to this, that we may be sons of God (*ut simus filii Dei*)." To enter into this filial reality constitutes the very "fruit of reparation (*fructus reparationis*).[157] As I argue in this section, this *fructus reparationis* accentuates the pneumatic finality of *reparatio* that has already begun to surface. Without offering here a full analysis of Bonaventure's teaching on adoption, a brief examination is thus relevant to the purposes of this study.[158]

For the sake of context, I begin with some preliminary comments. In Bonaventure's soteriology, Christ justifies us by his merit.[159] Justification, as Romano Guardini has shown, can be considered negatively or positively: "On the negative side, it is forgiveness of guilt and the remission (*Nachlassung*) of punishment; on the positive side, it makes the soul holy, pleasing to God, gives it a claim to eternal life and the ability to earn it."[160] Furthermore,

---

[154] *Brev.*, 4.2.6 (5:243a).
[155] *Brev.*, 4.5.6 (5:246a).
[156] *Brev.*, 5.1.5 (5:253a)
[157] *III Sent.*, d. 1, a. 2, q. 3, resp. (3:30a). Cf. Enzo Galli, "Dal *triplex verbum* alla filiazione divina: Un tentativo di attualizzazione del pensiero cristologico di san Bonaventura," *Miscellanea Francescana* 118 (2018): 40-52 at 48-50.
[158] For a helpful study of Bonaventure's theology of adoption, see Mary Melone, "Figli della Trinità o figli del Padre?," in *Deus summe cognoscibilis*, 605-625.
[159] Bonaventure's doctrine of justification has an inbuilt dynamism into it: "by his [Christ's] merit, we are justified through grace, advance in justice and are crowned with eternal glory" (*Brev.*, 4.7.6 [5:248a]). Justification entails that we "advance in justice," so as to make our way to eternal glory. The doctrine of justification is not separate from our cooperation with grace and the role of the Holy Spirit in our lives (see *Brev.*, 5.3.1 [5:254b]). It is not, in other words, a magical bolt of lightning that somehow immediately guarantees a kind of perpetual status. See Piolata, "The Center Blossoms, Part 1," 212-215.
[160] Guardini, *Lehre von der Erlösung*, 90.

justification is essentially synonymous with the bestowal of grace: "'Influere iustitiam' and 'dare gratiam' are synonyms."[161] Importantly, moreover, for this study is Guardini's observation that: "The doctrine of justification is summarized in the concept of sonship with God: 'adoptio', 'filiatio.'"[162] Turning now, then, to Bonaventure's doctrine of *adoptio*, my focus centers on the relation between the mission of the Son and the mission of the Spirit.

Bonaventure makes a key distinction in this regard, namely, between liberation and adoption. He states that the mission of the Incarnation was to redeem us from slavery (*ad redimendum a servitute*).[163] Once liberated from slavery, humanity could then be adopted as sons: "because it is necessary that humanity (*hominem*) be liberated from slavery, before being adopted as sons (*adoptari in filium*)."[164] Bonaventure appeals to this two-stage strategy, as it were, to explain why the Son would be sent first—and not the Spirit. "The mission in the flesh (*missio in carnem*) pertains (*competebat*) to that person, to whom it pertained to be sent first."[165] The first stage—liberation—pertains to the Son who originates from the Father alone; but the second stage—adoption—pertains to the Spirit who originates from both the Father and Son.[166] Bonaventure appeals to Paul's Letter to the Galatians (4:4-6) to confirm this two-stage framework:

> And this is what the Apostle says in Galatians 4: "When the fullness of time came, God sent his Son, etc." [v. 4]. And then: "So that [we might receive] adoption as sons of God, etc." [v. 5]. And then: "Since you are sons of God, God has sent the Spirit of his Son in your hearts" [v. 6].[167]

---

[161] Guardini, *Lehre von der Erlösung*, 89. Guardini cites *III Sent.*, d. 20, au., q. 3, fund. 4 (3:422b); Guardini's successive footnote is also relevant: *III Sent.*, d. 19, a. 1, q. 1, ad 3 (3:401b).

[162] Guardini, *Lehre von der Erlösung*, 95.

[163] *III Sent.*, d. 1, a. 2, q. 3, ad 5 (3:30b-31b).

[164] *III Sent.*, d. 1, a. 2, q. 3, ad 5 (3:30b).

[165] *III Sent.*, d. 1, a. 2, q. 3, ad 5 (3:30b-31a).

[166] The argument to which Bonaventure is responding (*III Sent.*, d. 1, a. 2, q. 3 opp. 6 [3:29a]) appealed to the notion of *subauctoritas*: "'to be sent' bespeaks *subauctoritatem* in the one sent," but the *ratio subauctoritatis* is found more so (*magis*) in the Spirit than in the Son, given that the Holy Spirit's origin is from both the Father and the Son. Bonaventure is happy to agree with the premise but denies the conclusion in light of the two-stage strategy he proffers, which infers, according to the logic of *subauctoritas*, that the Son should be sent first and then the Spirit.

[167] *III Sent.*, d. 1, a. 2, q. 3, ad 5 (3:31a).

Thus Bonaventure ultimately arrives at the following concise formula: "First, the Son came, so that humans would be liberated (*liberarentur*); and then the Holy Spirit, so that humans would be beatified (*beatificarentur*)."[168] The Spirit completes what the Son, who liberated us, initiates. This distinction between the Son's liberating mission and the Spirit's beatifying mission parallels the *Breviloquium*'s theology of *reparatio* insofar as Christ *reparat nos* for beatitude, and thus for the gift of grace and the Holy Spirit.

Bonaventure's perspective does not, however, entirely divorce the mystery of adoption from the work of Christ. Rather, by grounding it in the dynamic interplay of the missions of the Son and the Spirit, he avers that the Son *prepares* for our adoption. Accordingly, it is licit to say that we are adopted "through (*per*) Christ."[169] To say this is to identify Christ as the meritorious and preparatory cause of our adoption: "For he merited grace for us, through which we are adopted sons, insofar as he is Head of the Church."[170] Guardini comments: "Since the bestowal of grace (*Gnadenspendung*) itself is the immediate fruit of redemption (*Erlösung*), so is Christ the meritorious and preparatory cause of adoption (*Annahme an Kindes Statt*)."[171]

Yet it is also possible to speak of adoption in terms of its effective cause. A trinitarian formula results: "For the Father adopted us through the Son and the Holy Spirit."[172] This statement not only depicts the Father as the effective cause, but it also insinuates that this adoption takes place a) through the Son and b) through the Holy Spirit. To delineate their respective roles, Bonaventure unfolds yet another layer of the mystery:

> And if we speak in terms of appropriations, [the Father] adopted [us] through the Son with respect to its beginning (*quoad inchoationem*),

---

[168] *III Sent.*, d. 1, a. 2, q. 3, ad 5 (3:31b). Elsewhere, Bonaventure will speak of *reparatio* clearly in terms of beatitude: see, e.g., *III Sent.*, d. 20, au., q. 1, fund. 1 (3:417a), as well as *Brev.* 5.1.3 (5:252b) discussed above. This only further accentuates the pneumatic finality of *reparatio*: the emphasis on beatitude entails the mission of the Spirit.

[169] *III Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 2, resp. (3:236ab).

[170] *III Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 2, resp. (3:236a). Guardini (*Lehre von der Erlösung*, 95-96) highlights the importance of grace in Bonaventure's theology of adoption: "Diese 'adoptio' selbst aber ist identisch mit der 'acceptatio' der Gnade, der Rechtfertigung: 'Eben dadurch, daß Gott den Menschen in Gnade annimt, sieht er ihn als seinen Sohn an.'" Guardini is quoting *II Sent.*, d. 29, a. 1, q. 1, fund. 6 (2:695b).

[171] Guardini, *Lehre von der Erlösung*, 96.

[172] *III Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 2, resp. (3:236b).

and through the Holy Spirit with respect to its consummation (*quoad consummationem*). For our adoption, two things run together, namely redemption (*redemptio*), which takes place (*facta est*) through the mission of the Son, and gratification (*gratificatio*), which takes place through the mission of the Holy Spirit.[173]

Preparation anticipates consummation. The theology of this passage again hinges on the two-stage strategy mentioned above. Christ's mission introduces—literally: leads into—the mission of the Spirit. The Holy Spirit brings to completion that which begins in Christ. Accordingly, the Incarnation is not the "total cause (*totam causam*)" of our adoption: "our sonship (*filiatio*) is completed (*completur*) in the mission of the Holy Spirit."[174]

As Bonaventure puts it in a sermon—again drawing from Gal 4:4-6—when the Father gives his Son as our brother, he thereby gives himself also as Father. To give himself as Father, though, implicates the gift of the Holy Spirit. In his own words:

> "God sent his son born of a woman" [Gal 4:4]. He gave therefore his Son as [our] brother, he gave also himself as Father; hence it adds: "so that we might receive adoption as sons" [Gal 4:5]. And for this reason (*ex hoc*), he gave the Holy Spirit as consoler. Hence it adds: "Since you are sons of God, God has sent the Spirit of his Son in your hearts, in whom we cry out [Abba, Father]" [Gal 4:6].[175]

2.3 *Conclusion: The Pneumatic Form of Christian Life*

Bonaventure's theology of *reparatio* and *adoptio* illuminates the pneumatic finality of Christ's mission. The above reflection on *reparatio* and *adoptio* thereby suggests that Christian life is ultimately "pneumatic" in form. I by no means intend to marginalize the significance of Christ, which Bonaventure in no way does. Without question, his Christocentrism is robust, explicit, and key to his theological project as a whole. But that is just the point I want to emphasize: the centrality of Christ does not collapse within itself. It

---

[173] *III Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 2, resp. (3:236b).
[174] *III Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 2, ad 4 (3:237a). Similarly, in the previous question (q. 1, ad 4 [3:234b]), Bonaventure avers that the perfection of sonship implies that one be signed with the grace of similitude. This notion of "similitude" entails the indwelling of the Holy Spirit.
[175] *Sermo 1*, §4 (*SDD* 1:72-73).

is too vibrant and fecund: it is *origo et fons*. It flowers into the mission of the Holy Spirit.

Accentuating the "pneumatic form" of Christian life opens new horizons for Christian discipleship. Christian life is life newly prepared for *salus*, for eternal beatitude: to become temple of the Spirit, spouse of Christ, and daughter of the Father. It involves being created anew within the Body of Christ built up by the fire of the Holy Spirit whom Christ sent—created anew in the life of grace, *in vita gratuita*.[176] Living this life of grace—which branches out into the habits of the virtues (*Brev.*, 5.4), the gifts of the Spirit (*Brev.*, 5.5), and the beatitudes (*Brev.*, 5.6)—chronicles the expression of re-creation.[177] In other words, Christianity is not just about the fact of "liberation" but about what that liberation is for: that the Spirit, who calls us forth "from exile to the fatherland, from work to rest, from mourning to the most delightful and delicious sweetness of blessed enjoyment,"[178] might live within us. To take seriously the centerpiece of the Christian story as Christ's *reparatio* implies that Christian life itself is about the *fructus reparationis* (*adoptio*)—which fruit is brought to consummation by the Holy Spirit.

---

[176] *Brev.*, 5.3.2 (5:255a). See also Ennis, "The Place of Love," 140: "The new life in Christ, the new creation and mode of being, is given us by grace."

[177] In her study, Shelby draws attention to the structure of *Breviloquium* 5. She notes that Chapter 1-3 "all begin with, '*De gratia*'; those of Chapters 4-6, with '*De ramificatione gratiae*'; and those of Chapters 7-10, with '*De exercitio gratiae*'" (*Spiraling into God*, 151). She applies Benson's hermeneutic of *ortus—modus—fructus* to this threefold division and thus argues that, while "the final fruit of grace must always be located within Part 7," *Breviloquium* 5.7-10 "speak[s] about the *fructus* of grace in a much more immediate sense" (160). Shelby's analysis, in effect, highlights the pneumatic finality of Christian life—although she does not use that explicit terminology. By highlighting the reference to "Jacob's Ladder" (*Brev.*, 5.6.8 [5:260a]), she argues that the "*fructus* of grace [*Brev.*, 5.7-10] is that the soul itself becomes like a Jacob's Ladder" (162). This symbol indicates that the rational creature "has been made into a divine similitude … by being ordered to ever more fruitful relationships with God and the rest of the created order of reality" (161). As a "Jacob's Ladder," "the soul … is made capable of both 'ascending' to God through contemplation and 'descending' to its neighbor through perfect virtue. Through the inflowing of sanctifying grace, the soul is conformed to the entire Trinity and can remain there—it is assimilated to the First Principle—precisely insofar as it can now be 'fruitful' in both ways" (162). The reference to being made "fruitful" recalls Bonaventure's interpretation of hierarchy from Pseudo-Dionysius: in brief, the hierarchical return to God—wherein the rational creature becomes like God as much as possible—involves that the rational creature "become a *fruitful* creature whose goal is not merely mystical union with the Trinity at the expense of other creatures, but a union with the Trinity that inundates the rational creature with a divine fullness through which she can be ordered to other creatures as well" (94). See Shelby's helpful presentation of Bonaventure's theology of hierarchy in her *Spiraling Into God*, 77-113.

[178] See n15 above.

In a word, such a "pneumatic form" of Christian life does not focus *exclusively* on what Christ *did*, but contemplates more comprehensively his fruitful centrality, and thus rejoices in *whom* Christ sent. It illuminates the meaning of Christian existence as life in the Spirit *precisely because* to be a Christian is to be "in Christ." To be a Christian is to be set free by Christ: to be "free … in the mission of the Holy Spirit."[179] "Of all saints," Bonaventure reflects, "it is clear, that, so long as the grace of the Holy Spirit remained (*remansit*) with them, they were strong (*fortes*). … What strength would a person have (*quid valeret homo*) without (*nisi haberet*) the Holy Spirit?"[180]

In the end, this bonaventurean perspective is but a theological expression of the vision of Saint Francis of Assisi himself. Francis desired "to follow the teaching and footprints of our Lord Jesus Christ,"[181] to incarnate in his own life the Gospel life of Christ. For Francis, to live in this way is to live according to the "Spirit of the Lord." Francis instructs his brothers "to walk spiritually (*spiritualiter*),"[182] to serve and obey one another "through the charity of the Spirit [Gal 5:13],"[183] and "above all else: [to desire] to have the Spirit of the Lord and Its holy activity."[184] Ultimately, Francis extends this manner of life to all: he invites "all (*universis*) Christians, religious, clerics and lay, all (*omnibus*) men and women who live in the whole world" to be a "home and dwelling place" of the "Spirit of the Lord."[185] As Kajetan Esser, the great Franciscan scholar of the 20th century, put it: "For St. Francis, it is not only a matter of an outward imitation (*Nachahmung*) of the life of Jesus, but rather above all that the Spirit of Christ must become alive and active in the follower of Christ. This doctrine of the Spirit of the Lord may be called … the very heart of the thought and Christian behavior of St. Francis."[186] St.

---

[179] See n60 above.

[180] *Don. Spir.*, 5.8 (5:481a).

[181] *ER*, 1.1 (*FAED* 1:63-64).

[182] *ER* 5:4-5 (*FAED* 1:67), translation modified. See also *ER* 17:14-15 (*FAED* 1:75-76).

[183] *ER* 5:14 (*FAED* 1:67-68).

[184] *LR* 10.8 (*FAED* 1:105). Significantly, Thomas of Celano describes the fraternity as a "dwelling place of the Holy Spirit." "The Life of Saint Francis," 38 (*FAED* 1: 217).

[185] *2LtF*, 1 and 48 (*FAED* 1:45 and 48), translation modified. In effect, Francis thereby envisions the Order itself as a kind of archetypal embodiment of Christian life.

[186] Esser, "Studium und Wissenschaft im Geiste des hl. Franziskus von Assisi," *Wissenschaft und Weisheit* 39 (1976): 26-41 at 28. See also Optatus Van Asseldonk, "The Spirit of the Lord and Its Holy Activity in the Writings of Francis," trans. Edward Hagman, *Greyfriars Review* 5.1 (1991): 105-158.

Francis understood that to follow in the footprints of our Lord is to live by the Spirit. In St. Francis, then, one sees enfleshed the "pneumatic form" of Christian life proposed here. Indeed, as discussed in the previous chapter, Bonaventure understands St. Francis as signed by the love of the Holy Spirit.

3. Towards a Eucharistic Synthesis

Almost a century ago, in his incisive and still valuable article on Bonaventure's theology of the Eucharist, Stephanus Simonis observed that, while the question of the Eucharist has of recent "been much discussed (*agitata*)," "few if any (*parum vel ne parum*)" studies have attended specifically to the Franciscan school.[187] In light of such a conspicuous scarcity, Simonis thus took on the task to examine the eucharistic theology of Bonaventure, "since he, among the scholastic doctors, occupies a distinguished rank (*primarium locum*)." What was said 90 years ago unfortunately still remains fairly accurate, especially in the English speaking academy.[188] Bonaventure's theology of the Eucharist remains

---

[187] Stephanus Simonis, "De Causalitate Eucharistiae in Corpus mysticum: Doctrina S. Bonaventurae," *Antonianum* 8 (1933): 193-228 at 193.

[188] Thankfully, the recent scholarship of Hellmann and Benjamin Johnson has begun to remedy this lacuna: Hellmann, "Sacraments: Healing unto Glory," 14-19; *Idem*, "Charity in the Church—Charity in the Eucharist," in *The Spirit and the Church: Peter Damian Fehlner's Franciscan Development of Vatican II on the Themes of the Holy Spirit, Mary, and the Church*, ed. J.I Goff, C.W. Kappes, E. Ondrako (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2018), 247-256; Hellmann and T. Alexander Giltner, "Part VI: 'On the Sacramental Remedy,'" in *Bonaventure Revisited*, 245-272; Benjamin Luke Johnson, *The Embodiment of Charity: Bonaventure on the Eucharist and Marriage* (St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 2023). See also the introductions to two English translations of Bonaventure's treatment of the Eucharist in *IV Sent.*: "Theological Orientation to the Eucharist," in *Commentary on the Sentences: Sacraments*, Works of St. Bonaventure 17, trans. J.A. Wayne Hellmann et al. (St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 2016), 165-174; Junius Johnson, "Introduction," in *Bonaventure: On the Eucharist (Commentary on the Sentences, Book IV, dist. 8-13)*, Dallas Medieval Texts and Translations 23 (Leuven – Paris – Bristol, CT: Peeters, 2017), 1-51. Beyond the English speaking world, see Carlos Salto Solá, "L'alimento che accende il desiderio di comunione: la dimensione trinitaria del sacramento della eucaristia secondo Bonaventura da Bagnoregio," in *Deus summe cognoscibilis*, 521-533; Andrea Di Maio "L'agnello di Dio 'Pastor et Pastus' e la 'specialissima effigies et similitudo.' L'eucaristia tra simbologia e mistagogia in S. Bonaventura," *Doctor Seraphicus* 53 (2006): 7-42; Fortunato Iozzelli, "Il sermone *In cena Domini* di S. Bonaventura: 'Venite ad me omnes,'" *Doctor Seraphicus* 53 (2006): 43-66; Rolando Alfonso Pompei, "L'eucaristia segno sacramentale dell'amore con cui Cristo si dona all'umanità," *Doctor Seraphicus* 53 (2006): 99-123; María Teresa Maio, "L'eucaristia segno sacramentale ed efficace dell'unità della Chiesa nel pensiero di san Bonaventura," *Miscellanea Francescana* 105 (2005): 3-20; *Idem*, "Sacramento de la Eucaristía: Sacrificio de oblación según San Buenaventura," *Miscellanea*

underappreciated and understudied. This deficit, however, should not only concern the academic. Within the life of the Church, a narrow perspective of the Eucharist can only curb catechesis, preaching, and piety. That is to say: it is all too easy and common to limit reflection on the Eucharist to "transubstantiation" and the metaphysics of presence. But the Eucharist is much more. What about the bread and wine? What about the Mystical Body, the Church? What about charity? What about the Holy Spirit? A limited view results in a truncated vision that does not do justice to the tradition.

Bonaventure's theology foils such a truncated vision. He invites a deeper, more comprehensive and spiritual approach to the Eucharist. Just as his Christocentrism does not confine itself centripetally to Christ the center, so his eucharistic theology accentuates but does not restrict itself to Christ's presence—the centrality of the Eucharist. Rather, the stress falls on Christ's Body and Blood as penultimate: the Sacrament's center does not terminate the mystery but signifies and mediates beyond itself. Penultimate presence anticipates the ultimate reality: the union of the Mystical Body and thus the unitive love of the Holy Spirit.

In what follows, after some brief introductory remarks about Bonaventure's sacramental theology in general, the broad objective is to present the basic shape of his eucharistic theology. The more specific goal is to explicate the pneumatic finality of this Sacrament. By focusing on this pneumatic finality of the Eucharist, this concluding section thus offers a "Eucharistic synthesis" of the theology hitherto explored.

Lastly, I should mention that, although space limits me from a fuller examination of Bonaventure's theology of the seven sacraments, my decision to focus on the Eucharist is above all theological. In a word, as the Sacrament of charity, this final reflection provides just the opportunity to develop a concluding exploration and synthesis of the finality of the Spirit.

3.1 *Christ's Sacramental Mission: <u>Breviloquium</u> 6*

Francescana 102 (2002): 17-71; *Idem*, "La eucaristía: Sacrificio, Sacramento y Viático según San Buenaventura," *Miscellanea Francescana* 101 (2001): 433-494.

I begin with a brief word about the way in which Christ's mission, which culminates in the mission of the Holy Spirit, is sacramental. As discussed above, Christ's reparative mission prepares anew the human person—*capax Dei*—for eternal beatitude. For Bonaventure, *reparatio* therefore anticipates the sacramental economy, inasmuch as sacraments cure the soul's infirmity and thereby ordain it to its ultimate end (*ad finem ultimum*).[189] Accordingly, the sacraments are not an appendage to Christ's mission. Rather, they are intrinsic to *reparatio* and attest to the role of creation itself in the journey to the *plenitudo bonitatis* of eternal beatitude. Originally designed to aid the human person to love and praise the Creator, created elements remain integral to our re-creation. The Incarnation does not render creation obsolete.

As Bonaventure develops his sacramental theology in *Breviloquium* Part 6, he continues to incorporate medicinal language. Doing so thus links his sacramental theology to Christ the center (*Brev.* 4) and to the curative grace of the Holy Spirit (*Brev.* 5). "Just as God created all things through the Uncreated Word, so he would cure (*curaret*) all things through the Incarnate Word," says Bonaventure in Part 4.[190] In Part 6, then, Bonaventure treats the sacramental remedies (*de medicina sacramentali*), the goal of which lies in the "cure and health (*cura et salus*) of humanity."[191] The sacraments are "sensible signs, divinely instituted as medicinal remedies (*medicamenta*)."[192] Christ, the *principium reparativum*, is the *medicus* who came to heal the "sickness (*aegrotum*) of the human race."[193] Sacraments are the "sanctifying remedies (*medicamenta sanctificantia*)"—hence *sacra-menta*.[194] Christ the *principium reparativum* repairs *per medicamenta Sacramentorum*.[195]

---

[189] *Brev.*, 6.1.2 (5:265a).

[190] *Brev.*, 4.1.2 (5:124a).

[191] *Brev.*, 6.1.6 (5:265b-266a).

[192] *Brev.*, 6.1.2 (5:265a).

[193] *Brev.*, 6.1.3 (5:265a). Bonaventure makes frequent reference to Christ *principium reparativum* throughout Part 6.

[194] *Brev.*, 6.1.6 (5:266a).

[195] *Brev.*, 6.10.2 (5:275b). See also *Sermo 4*, §6 (*SD*:159), which identifies Christ as the "medium vitalis influentiae" who enlivens the members of the Mystical Body by the sacraments.

As alluded to above, moreover, sacraments incorporate the mystery of creation itself into the design of *reparatio*.[196] By dint of their intrinsic semiotic constitution, created elements anticipate their role in the sacramental economy, wherein—as sacramental—they prepare for grace, "through which our soul is healed and cured."[197] In their sacramental mode, created realities dispose the soul to the healing grace of the Holy Spirit. "The whole soul would become curable (*curabilis fieret*) by the grace of the Holy Spirit."[198] Ultimately, then, in these sensible signs, "the grace of the Holy Spirit is received (*suscipitur*) and is found (*invenitur*) in them by those who approach."[199] To this degree, one can speak of a certain pneumatic finality of sacramental life.

Therefore, the *Breviloquium* continues to manifest that Bonaventure's Christocentrism does not remain locked in place in Part 4. Indeed, in Part 6 Christ is again identified as *ortus*.[200] Part 6 *De medicina sacramentali* surfaces as the fruit of Christ's centrality and as essential to the work of *reparatio*. Sacraments render Christ's reparative mission tangible and sensible, and faciliate encounter with the Holy Spirit, who is "received … in them (*suscipitur in eis*)." In fact, with the term *suscipitur*, Bonaventure reminds the reader of the pentecostal conclusion of his treatment of Christology in Part 4. Therein, in his description of Pentecost, he uses the same term: "ad Spiritus sancti susceptionem."[201] The Christic center, which itself blossomed pentecostally already in Part 4, continues to blossom pneumatologically in the sacramental remedies. This sacramental unfolding of Christ's reparative mission further strengthens the idea, developed in the previous section, of Christian life as pneumatic in form.

The pneumatic form of Christian life explored above is thus sacramental—and, as a result, inseparable from the life of the Church. Indeed,

---

[196] The gift of creation intimates the gift of the sacramental economy. One might say that the "giftedness" of created being, which is given in the Holy Spirit who is *donum in quo omnia alia dona donantur*, anticipates the salvific gift of sacraments, through which the uncreated Gift is given with and in the gift of grace.

[197] *Brev.*, 6.1.3 (5:265b).

[198] *Brev.*, 6.1.4 (5:265b). Cf. Hellmann and Giltner, "Part VI: 'On the Sacramental Remedy,'" 250.

[199] *Brev.*, 6.1.5 (5:265b).

[200] *Brev.*, 5.1.6 (5:265b).

[201] *Brev.*, 4.10.7 (5:251b).

for Bonaventure, the Christian pilgrimage is not undergone in isolation: "The 'ship' (*navis*), through which the human person traverses (*transit super*) the waves of this sea [i.e., the world], is the grace of the Holy Spirit, or the ship is the Church, which is connected (*iuncta*) by the glue of charity (*glutino caritatis*)."[202] Ultimately, sacraments accompany the mystical journey of human life. Indeed, to embrace sacraments is to become a mystic. After all, a sacramental life requires, first and foremost, a certain appreciation of the mystical depths of creation. As Hellmann perceptively writes:

> only on the foundation of the created sign are we able to perceive, understand, or receive the sacramental grace given by God. … Can you imagine what it would be like if our catechesis on Baptism began with pondering the story, nature, role, and beauty of Sister Water, "who is very useful and humble and precious and chaste"? … How much do we miss in our sacramental theology if we fail to begin with the embrace of God's creation?[203]

Furthermore, in the sacraments, we receive the "grace of the Holy Spirit." And the gift of the Holy Spirit propels the mystical life. Recall that, for Bonaventure, the human *transitus* with Christ to the Father is impossible without the fire of the Holy Spirit, without that wisdom revealed through the Holy Spirit. To pose a similar question as Hellmann: How much do we miss in our sacramental theology if we unyoke sacraments from our spiritual *transitus ex hoc mundo ad Patrem*?

3.2 *The Eucharist: Sacrament of Charity*

To present Bonaventure's theology of the Eucharist, I begin with his own presentation in *IV Sent*. Therein, he appeals to the threefold sacramental framework, pulled directly from the Lombard and rooted in Augustine, of the

---

[202] *IV Sent*., d. 14, p. 1, dub. 1 (4:328a). Bonaventure does not specify the sense of this *vel*, but in the context it seems clear enough that it is not exclusive but inclusive.

[203] Hellmann, "Healing unto Glory," 12 and 14; Hellmann is quoting Francis of Assisi, Ctc 7 (*FAED* 1:114).

sacramentum tantum, *res et sacramentum*, and *res tantum*. This framework describes the structure of the Sacrament of the Eucharist.[204]

- *Sacramentum tantum*: the visible species (i.e., bread and wine)
- *Res et sacramentum*: the true Body and Blood of Christ
- *Res tantum*: the Mystical Body of Christ

Bonaventure turns to Hugh of St. Victor to explain this structure: "According to what Hugh says, 'the first [= *sacramentum tantum*] is a sign of the second [= *res et sacramentum*] and of the third [= *res tantum*]; the second is the reality of the first (*res primi*) and the sign and cause of the third; and the third is the reality of the second (*res secundi*) and the truth of the first.'"[205]

Although this threefold structure is fairly well known, it is easy to underappreciate the theology therein contained. This triadic structure of the Eucharist reveals that the true Body and Blood of Christ is *not* the ultimate reality of the Sacrament. Christ—the Center!—is the *medium* of this sacramental structure: his presence is a mediating presence.[206] A myopic focus on Christ's presence thus marginalizes the significance of that presence precisely as sacramental—a "sign of something else (*alterius signum*)"[207]—that ultimately causes the *res tantum* of the Sacrament.

What does it mean, however, to say that the Mystical Body is the *res tantum* of the Sacrament? For Bonaventure, the answer is clear: "the *res* of this Sacrament is said to be the Mystical Body not *ratione partium*, but *ratione unionis*; and that union is the grace and effect of the Sacrament."[208] "The *res* of this Sacrament," writes Simonis, "is the grace of union by which the members are connected to one another."[209] In other words, the *res tantum* is the union of the Mystical Body of Christ: to be more (*magis*) incorporated

---

[204] *IV Sent.*, d. 8, p. 2, a. 2, q. 1 (4:195a). Cf. Ronald King, "The Origin and Evolution of a Sacramental Formula: *Sacramentum Tantum, Res et Sacramentum, Res Tantum*," *The Thomist* 31 (1967): 21-82.
[205] *IV Sent.*, d. 8, p. 2, a. 2, q. 1, resp. (4:196a).
[206] See *IV Sent.*, d. 8, p. 2, a. 2, q. 1, ad 2 (4:196b).
[207] *IV Sent.*, d. 8, p. 2, a. 1, q. 1, resp. (4:191a).
[208] *IV Sent.*, d. 8, p. 2, a. 2, q. 1, ad 5.6 (4:196b).
[209] Simonis, "De Causalitate," 210.

to Christ and more (*magis*) united to one another.[210] The union of the Mystical Body is the *unum significatum ultimum* of the Eucharist.[211]

To further clarify what this "union" means, important is the distinction between spiritual and sacramental eating. In brief: to eat "sacramentally" is to eat with the "mouth of the body" and to eat "spiritually" is to eat with the "mouth of the heart."[212] Especially significant in this regard is Bonaventure's theology of spiritual eating. To understand what spiritual eating entails, Bonaventure first specifies the two main activities involved in normal bodily eating: "chewing (*masticatio*)" and then the "incorporation (*incorporatio*)" of that which was eaten into the body. Accordingly, spiritual eating also involves a certain "chewing" and "incorporation":

> Spiritual "chewing" is reflecting on the food (*recogitatio cibi*), namely on the flesh of Christ given (*expositae*) to us as the price for redemption and as food for refreshment. "Incorporation" is found in this: when the one reflecting with the love of charity is joined (*iungitur*) to that which is thought over (*cogitatur*), and thus incorporated, and when incorporated, is refreshed and assimilated more.[213]

Put briefly: to chew involves the reflection of faith (*recogitatio fidei*), and to incorporate involves the affection of charity (*affectio caritatis*). To eat spiritually is to eat *per fidem et caritatem*.[214] Proper reception of the Eucharist constitutes a spiritual exercise that engages faith and affection, the spiritual depths of human personhood.[215] Our capacity to receive Christ lies not in the flesh but in the the spirit, not in the stomach but in the mind, so that through faith and love, we are brought into the Mystical Body.[216] "This food is

---

[210] *IV Sent.*, d. 8, p. 2, a. 2, q. 1, ad 5.6 (4:196b); see also *IV Sent.*, d. 9, dub. 4 (4:213a).

[211] *IV Sent.*, d. 8, p. 2, a. 2, q. 2, ad 2 (4:198ab); see also ad 4 (4:198b).

[212] *IV Sent.*, d. 9, a. 1, q. 1 (4:201-202).

[213] *IV Sent.*, d. 9, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (4:203b).

[214] *Brev.*, 6.9.1 (5:273b-274a).

[215] In fact, the reference to "mouth of the heart" recalls Augustine's own use of the phrase in the *Confessions* 9.10 (CCSL 27:147), when he describes the spiritual experience he and his mother shared at Ostia before she died. If this reference is correct, it further substantiates the notion that the Sacrament of the Eucharist invites us into a spiritual exercise, to enter into mystical union.

[216] "Finally, since our capacity for receiving efficaciously Christ is not in the flesh, but in the spirit, not in the stomach, but in the mind—and the mind does not grasp Christ except through knowledge and love (*per cognitionem et amorem*), through faith and charity, so that faith illuminates one for reflection (*illuminat ad recogitationem*), and love inflammes one to devotion (*caritas inflammat ad devotionem*)—then, in order for one to approach worthily, it is therefore necessary that she eat spiritually, so that she chews through the

spiritual (*spiritualis est*)," Bonaventure says explicitly; it is not like meat given "from the butcher (*de macello*)."[217] Christ invites us not to a carnal, but to a spiritual banquet (*convivium spiritualis*).[218]

The distinction between spiritual and sacramental eating also ultimately has roots in Augustine. For Augustine, "we eat and drink for participation in the spirit (*usque ad spiritus participationem*) … that we may be invigorated (*vegetemur*) by his spirit."[219] Yves Congar comments:

> The flesh of Christ present sacramentally on its own has nothing to offer in itself. It has to be given life by charity in our eating of it, and that is precisely what the Spirit does. In a word, the Spirit gives life to those who receive communion. The latter must not simply receive the sacrament, however, but must eat and drink to the point of sharing in the Spirit.[220]

For Bonaventure, heir of this tradition, the doctrine of spiritual eating thus implies that to "receive" communion—as is commonly said—is ultimately about "entering into" communion. Bonaventure's specific explication of *incorporatio* corroborates such a view. He clarifies that, in terms of "incorporation," the similarity between spiritual and bodily eating falls short. In bodily eating, that is, the food eaten is incorporated into the body of the one who eats. Something different takes place in spiritual eating, though: the one eating is incorporated into the food eaten, since "we are rather changed and incorporated into it, and not the other way around."[221]

---

reflection of faith (*per recogitationem fidei masticet*) and receives through the devotion of love (*per devotionem amoris suscipiat*), through which she does not transform Christ into herself, but rather is brought into (*traiiciatur*) his Mystical Body." *Brev.*, 6.9.6 (5:275a).

[217] *Sermo 17*, §4 (*SDD* 1:266). See also *Sermo 18*, §6 (*SDD* 1:276). The reference to a butcher is likely a reference to Augustine, "Tractatus XXVII," 5 (CCSL 36:272): "[Flesh] does not profit anything [cf. Jn 6:64], but as they understood: for they understood it as something that is torn apart as a corpse (*in cadauere dilaniatur*), or sold in a butcher's shop (*in macello uenditur*)."

[218] *Sermo 17*, §4 (*SDD* 1:264); *Sermo 18*, §5 (*SDD* 1:274).

[219] Augustine, "Tractatus XXVII," 11 (CCSL 36:276); Yves Congar cites this passage in his *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol. 3, *The River of Life Flows in the East and in the West*, trans. David Smith (New York – London: The Seabury Press – Geoffrey Chapman, 1983), 259.

[220] Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol. 3, 260. According to Congar, though the distinction between spiritual and sacramental eating has roots in Augustine, "the expression *manducatio spiritualis* is not used as such by Augustine" (259). This expression is made thematic in later medieval theology, especially in Peter Lombard and then the tradition that follows therefrom.

[221] *IV Sent.*, d. 9, a. 1, q. 2, ad 3 (4:204b).

The stress on faith and charity accentuates this Sacrament's connection to and role in nourishing the unity of the Mystical Body. Indeed, for Bonaventure, "the unity of the Church consists in faith and charity."[222] Ultimately, however, ecclesial union is consummated *per vinculum caritatis*.[223] This relationship is imbedded within Bonaventure's theology of spiritual eating: eating through faith "prepares for incorporation; this, though, is perfected through charity."[224] Accordingly, the emphasis within Bonaventure's eucharistic theology falls primarily on charity. Hence he refers to the Eucharist as *Sacramentum caritatis*,[225] *signum et sacramentum amoris*,[226] *sacramentum communionis et dilectionis*,[227] *vinculum caritatis*.[228] In the Eucharist, "supreme charity is expressed (*summa exprimitur caritas*)."[229] Indeed, the Eucharist is a "sign of love (*signum dilectionis*)," which is an even greater sign of love than the Incarnation and the Passion. In the latter two, there remains "a certain separation and division between the one giving and the gift." In the Eucharist, however, "there is a remarkable and endless union between the one who eats and the food (*inter cibatum et cibum*), and the conversion of one into the other."[230]

In order to draw us into the union of the Mystical Body through charity, this Sacrament of communion and love thus mediates charity. It is itself a gift of charity. In other words, the Eucharist does not only signify "communion and love" but actually "enkindles" what it signifies (*inflammat ad illam*):

> And what especially (*maxime*) sets us on fire with mutual love (*nos inflammat ad dilectionem mutuam*) and especially unites the members is the unity of the Head, from whom mutual love (*dilectio mutua*) flows (*manat*) into us through the diffusive, unitive, and transformative power of love (*vim amoris*): hence it is the case that in this Sacrament, the true body and immaculate flesh of Christ is contained such that (*ut*) it

---

[222] *Brev.*, 3.11.4 (5:240b).

[223] *Brev.*, 5.8.4 (5:262a). See also Simonis, "De Causalitate," 212-214; Maio, "L'eucaristia segno sacramentale," 17-18.

[224] Simonis, "De Causalitate," 214. See n213 above.

[225] *In Luc.*, 11.31 (7:286b).

[226] *IV Sent.*, d. 8, p. 1, a. 2, q. 2, resp. and ad 4 (4:186a and 186b); *Sermo 33*, §9 (*SD*:364).

[227] *Brev.*, 6.9.3 (5:274a).

[228] *IV Sent.*, d. 8, p. 1, a. 2, q. 1, resp. (4:184b); *IV Sent.*, d. 13, a. 1, q. 4, resp. (4:307b); *In Ioann.*, 6.90 (6:334a).

[229] *IV Sent.*, d. 12, p. 2, a. 1, q. 1, resp. (4:289b-290a).

[230] *Sermo 18*, §13 (*SD*:265).

diffuses itself into us, unites us to one another, and transforms us into it through a most burning charity (*per ardentissimam caritatem*).[231]

Per ardentissimam caritatem: the pneumatic finality of Bonaventure's eucharistic theology at this point begins to emerge. First and foremost, Eucharistic terminology is pneumatological terminology. The Holy Spirit *is* personally *caritas*, *communio*, *dilectio mutua*. Metaphorically, moreover, Bonaventure calls the Holy Spirit *calor ardentissimus*.[232] In a word, the mutual love mediated by the Eucharist that effects union is inseparable from the mutual Love that is the Spirit—the *unio consequens distinctionem* of the Father and the Son.

Furthermore, earlier in *Breviloquium* 4, Bonaventure had explicitly stated that Christ sent the Holy Spirit to enkindle charity (*ut inflammaret ad caritatem*).[233] Now in Part 6, the reader discovers this charity-enkindling mystery anew in the Eucharist. In Part 4, Bonaventure had said that the Holy Spirit—who builds up and ultimately brings to consummation the Mystical Body—"is charity and is had through charity."[234] Now in Part 6, the reader discovers that the Eucharist unites us to one another through charity. Earlier in Part 5, Bonaventure had taught that that the Mystical Body is consummated *per vinculum caritatis*. Now in Part 6 he intimates that this consummation *per vinculum caritatis* refers to the Holy Spirit *and* the Eucharist, or the Holy Spirit as mediated through the Eucharist.

To illustrate further this connection, it is worth presenting here a broad tapestry of pneumatological insights in St. Bonaventure, many of which have already emerged in this study:

- "The Holy Spirit is given to unite and bind together the members of the Mystical Body."[235] Indeed, the Holy Spirit "unites [the communion of saints]."[236]

---

[231] *Brev.*, 6.9.3 (274ab). See also *IV Sent.*, d. 12, p. 2, a. 2, q. 3, resp. (4:293ab).

[232] *Hex.*, 21.2 (5:431ab). See also *In Luc.*, 3.39 (7:79b): "The love of the Holy Spirit is rightly designated through fire (*ignem*)."

[233] *Brev.*, 4.10.7 (5:251b)—see n69 above.

[234] *Brev.*, 4.10.8 (5:252a)—see n70 above.

[235] *I Sent.*, d. 14, a. 2, q. 1, fund. 4 (1:249a)—see n73 above.

[236] *Hex.*, 8.19 (5:372b)—see n23 above.

- The Holy Spirit is mutual love, *nexus*, *unitas* of the Father and Son.[237] The Spirit is, consequently, exemplar of ecclesial unity.[238]
- The gift of charity is "from the Holy Spirit and with the Holy Spirit, and never without [the Holy Spirit]."[239]
- Christ the Head pours forth "the Holy Spirit into the members of the Church"[240]—and in the Eucharist mutual love flows into us from the Head of the Body.
- Especially significant is the role that Romans 5:5 plays in Bonaventure's pneumatology: "The love of God (*caritas Dei*) is poured forth into our hearts *through the Holy Spirit*, who is given to us."[241] For this reason, the "sign (*signaculum*) of the Holy Spirit is love (*dilectio*)."[242]

In sum, Bonaventure enfolds pneumatology within his theology of the Eucharist and vice versa.

Bonaventure's commentary on Luke 22:15, when Christ expresses his desire "to eat" the Passover with the apostles, offers a fine synthesis of this connection:

> That eating (*manducatio*) designates incorporation and the unity of the members into the unity of the Body. This takes place (*quod fit*) through the inflammation of love (*per amoris inflammationem*). And Christ especially desired this, according to what was said above in Chapter 12: "I have come to send fire to the earth" [v. 49].[243]

I have already noted the pneumatological import of Luke 12:49. The fire spoken of there is the Holy Spirit.[244] The *inflammatio amoris* of which Jesus speaks—through which incorporation into the unity of the Body takes place—is tied to the sending of the Holy Spirit.[245] Consequently, the *res tantum*—union of the Mystical Body—that takes place "through the inflammation of love" is inseparable from the Holy Spirit. The Eucharist is the very communication of that inflammation of love, which draws us deeper into the

---

[237] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 2, resp. (1:202b)—see n174 in Part One, Chapter Three above.
[238] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 3, fund. 1 (1:199a)—see n311 in Part One, Chapter Three above.
[239] *In Ioann.*, 20.53 (6:515b)—see n117 above.
[240] *Hex.*, 1.20 (5:332b)—see n137 above.
[241] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 2, fund. 4 (1:197a), emphasis mine—see n112 above, as well as *I Sent.*, d. 14, a. 2, q. 1, fund. 1 (1:249a); *In Ioann.*, 13.48 and 17.45 (6:434a and 476-477a); *In Luc.* 2.61 (7:58b); *Sermo 27*, §5 (*SD*:323); *Hex.*, 23.11 (5:446b).
[242] *In Ioann.*, 13.48 (6:434a).
[243] *In Luc.*, 22.21 (7:545a).
[244] See my comments at the end of Section 1.1.3 above.
[245] See n42 above.

union of the Mystical Body and Christ himself. Christ's mission to send fire to the earth is realized sacramentally in the Eucharist. Just as the life of Jesus did not end with the Passion, but in the gift of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost—the *fructus* of the Passion!—so, too, does the Eucharist culminate in the gift of the fire of the Holy Spirit. The Eucharist, precisely as a memorial of the Passion, is thus also the sacramental celebration of Pentecost, of the charity of the Spirit. Most fitting words from a sermon come to mind: "'Eat, friends' [Cant 5:1], by chewing through the truth of faith; 'and drink,' by incorporating so that you may have sanctity of life; 'and be inebriated,' *through the charity of the Holy Spirit.*"[246]

One might thus say that the *res tantum* of the Eucharist, in the final analysis, entails the gift of the Holy Spirit. In fact, Hellmann proposes precisely this conclusion:

> the true body of Christ . . . points to an even deeper reality beyond itself to the reality of participation in the charity that is the gift of the Spirit, the *nexus*, the *vinculum* or bond of charity. The Spirit, uncreated charity, is the full and final *res* of the sacrament of the Eucharist.[247]

What Hellmann has perceptively intuited, this section has corroborated, fleshed out, and developed further.[248]

---

[246] *Sermo 17*, §4 (*SDD* 1:267), emphasis mine. St. Francis, says Bonaventure, was thus often drunk in the Spirit (*spiritu ebrius*) after receiving the Eucharist; see *LMj*., 9.2 (8:530b).

[247] Hellmann, "Charity in the Church," 254. See also his "Healing unto Glory," 16 and 18: "The fullness of the Eucharistic gift involves not only the body and blood of Christ, but also what is mediated by the body and blood of Christ, namely, the Uncreated Gift, the Holy Spirit transforming us. … The final *res* or purpose of eating and drinking in the Eucharist is to receive the uncreated gift of the Holy Spirit." Cf. Salto Solá, "L'alimento," 530-531.

[248] Less I be misinterpreted, however, a brief point of clarification should be made. I do not want to suggest that the union of the Mystical Body of Christ (*res tantum* of the Eucharist) *is* the Holy Spirit. Rather, inasmuch as the *res tantum* is the union of the Mystical Body of Christ, and inasmuch as the Eucharist thus mediates charity, then the finality of the Eucharist cannot but also entail the gift of the Holy Spirit—which gift realizes the fullness of the *res tantum* that is the unity of the Mystical Body. This perspective coheres well with the theology developed by Pope Benedict XVI in his *Sacramentum caritatis*. Commenting on the meaning of the epiclesis, he writes: "[the epiclesis is] the petition to the Father to send down the gift of the Spirit so that the bread and the wine will become the body and blood of Jesus Christ and that 'the community as a whole will become ever more the body of Christ.' The Spirit invoked by the celebrant upon the gifts of bread and wine placed on the altar is the same Spirit who gathers the faithful 'into one body' and makes of them a spiritual offering pleasing to the Father. … It is significant that the Second Eucharistic Prayer, invoking the Paraclete, formulates its prayer for the unity of the Church as follows: '*may all of us who share in the body and blood of Christ be brought together in unity by the Holy Spirit.*' These

Admittedly, thinking about the Eucharist in terms of pneumatic finality or in the way Hellmann articulates is striking. At the least, it is not common place. Yet, to be sure, it simply coheres with Bonaventure's overall theological vision. In this regard, permit me to underscore two points.

First, to the degree that the *res tantum* of the Eucharist is the union of the Mystical Body through charity, then it cannot but be related to the gift and mission of the Holy Spirit. "The inner unity of the Church," to echo Fehlner, "is inexplicable apart from a consideration of that charity which is proper to the Holy Spirit."[249] In this regard, moreover, it is significant to note that, with respect to the 12 articles of the Creed, Bonaventure enfolds belief in the Eucharist not under the article about the Passion of Christ, but under the unity of the Church.[250] And as noted above, Bonaventure understands the article about the unity of the Church as pertaining to the mission of the Spirit.[251]

Second, as discussed above, for Bonaventure the aim of Christ's Ascension—especially in light of its relation to Pentecost—is to facilitate a certain maturation from carnal to spiritual love. Christ prepares his disciples for "spiritual love," for the "reception of the Holy Spirit" so that their love would be "entirely spiritual."[252] Love focused exclusively on the flesh of Christ can impede the advent of the Holy Spirit.[253] Bonaventure's eucharistic theology calls for this same movement: from the flesh to the spirit, from the visible to the invisible. The *sacramentum et res* points to the *res tantum*. Accordingly, a more complete picture of the Eucharist—that does not stop at the *sacramentum et res*—thus cultivates a similar maturation from carnal to spiritual love. Christ is center—*medium*—not only in salvation history, but in the *Sacramentum caritatis*, as well. Not only is Christology in general truncated to the degree that it fails to contemplate Christ's sending of the Spirit, the pentecostal *fructus* of the Passion, but so, too, is theology of the Eucharist itself.

---

words help us to see clearly how the *res* of the sacrament of the Eucharist is the unity of the faithful within ecclesial communion" (§13 and §15). See also n258 and 260 below.

[249] Fehlner, *Role of Charity*, 77.

[250] See *III Sent*., d. 15, a. 1, q. 1, ad 3 (3:537a); cf. Rufin Šilić, *Christus und die Kirche: Ihr Verhältnis nach der Lehre des heiligen Bonaventura* (Breslau: Müller & Seiffert, 1938), 190.

[251] See n23 above.

[252] See n39 above.

[253] See n27 above.

Ultimately, thinking about the Eucharist in this way draws us deeper into the depth and breadth of the tradition itself. To draw this section to a close, then, I draw attention to a couple of sources within the wider tradition that cohere with the basic shape of the eucharistic theology explored above. In doing so, I ask some select questions to spur further reflection.

Mention has already been made above to St. Augustine, whose authority especially in the Latin West would be hard to overestimate. Yet, one wonders if elements of his eucharistic theology—which clearly inspired Bonaventure's own synthesis—have been forgotten. How might a more comprehensive retrieval of Augustine's teaching on the Eucharist add to contemporary catechesis and devotion?

In addition to Augustine, there is the ancient eucharistic prayer within the *Traditio Apostolica* from the 3rd century. Gerhard Lohfink identifies this prayer as "one of the oldest Eucharist Prayers."[254] In this ancient prayer, there is a petition (epiclesis) that asks for the Holy Spirit: "And we ask that you would send your Holy Spirit …" Lohfink comments: "the Holy Spirit, transforming the gifts [of bread and wine], is likewise asked to fill and transform the assembled believers so that they may be of one mind and be strengthened in faith and truth."[255] To what degree do we, today, discuss this transformation of the believers? Lohfink then makes an important observation: "What is surprising … is that the summoning of the Holy Spirit on the believers, and their transformation, occupies much more space than the request regarding the bread and wine."[256] The Sacrament, in other words, invites participation "in the fullness of the Holy Spirit."[257] Especially relevant here are also the words of St. Fulgentius of Ruspe (†532):

> Recognize, therefore, what takes place (*agitur*) in the offering of the sacrifice, so that you may understand why the coming (*aduentus*) of the Holy Spirit is invoked there. … Therefore, the sacrifice is offered so that the death of the Lord may be proclaimed (*annuntietur*), and a commemoration (*commemoratio*) of him who laid down his life (*posuit animam suam*) for us is made. … Since therefore *Christ died for us in*

---

[254] Lohfink, *Prayer Takes us Home: The Theology and Practice of Christian Prayer*, trans. Linda M. Maloney (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2020), 172.

[255] Lohfink, 176.

[256] Lohfink, 176.

[257] From the *Apostolic Tradition*, quoted in Lohfink, 174.

charity (*caritate*), at the time of the sacrifice when we make commemoration of his death, we implore (*postulamus*) *that charity be given to us* (*nobis tribui*) *through the advent of the Holy Spirit.*[258]

Do we emphasize adequately today the transformation of the believers by the presence of the Holy Spirit? Or is the transformation of the bread and wine the exclusive focus?

Lastly, I think of the ancient Syrian tradition and specifically of St. Ephrem the Syrian from the 4th century.[259] In his beautiful poetry, St. Ephrem contemplates in the Eucharist the Holy Spirit:

> In your bread is hidden the Spirit which cannot be eaten.
> In your wine dwells the fire that cannot be drunk.
> Spirit in your bread, fire in your wine. . . .
> Your fire, O our Lord, we have eaten in your offering ….
> Behold the fire and the Spirit in the womb which bore you ….
> Fire and the Holy Spirit are in the bread and the cup.[260]

Ephrem's mystical gaze penetrates deep into the eucharistic mystery. His words almost evade commentary. Does contemporary preaching encourage such a contemplative outlook? What kind of eucharistic spirituality might Ephrem's mystical poetry cultivate? What is lost in our own eucharistic theology when, upon gazing on the altar, we do not even know to look for "fire and the Holy Spirit"?

To conclude with one final question: Might St. Bonaventure today offer, especially to the Latin tradition, the sources and vision to retrieve a richer, more traditional and mystical eucharistic theology?

3.3 *Conclusion: Eucharistic Structure as Trinitarian and Historical*

To draw this chapter to a close, I offer here a final reflection that draws from Bonaventure's eucharistic vision in order to develop it further. In so doing, I present a concise synthesis of key themes of this study. In brief, I

---

[258] *Contra Fabianum*, 28.16-17 (CCSL 91A:813), emphasis mine.

[259] See Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol. 3, 262-263.

[260] Ephrem the Syrian, *The Hymns on Faith*, trans. Jeffrey T. Wickes, The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation 130 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 2015), 122-124. Cf. John Paul II, *Ecclesia de Eucharistia*, §17.

consider the structure of the Eucharist thus far explored as trinitarian and historical. The Eucharist reflects the trinitarian structure of being—*tota nostra metaphysica*—and thus history as a whole.

First: the *sacramentum tantum*—bread and wine. Does this not refer to the gift of creation itself? To contemplate bread and wine is to contemplate the creating power of God, appropriation of the Father—*ratio efficiendi*.

Second: *sacramentum et res*—the true Body and Blood of Christ. Does this not refer to the *medium* of the Holy Trinity who became man in the Incarnation, the *medium reducens* of salvation history itself? To contemplate the true Body and Blood of Christ is to contemplate the exemplary center of the Trinity—*ratio exemplandi*.

Third: *res tantum*—the union of the Mystical Body, the Church. Does this not refer to the goal of the perfect unity—the *unitas caritatis*—for which Christ prayed, namely, the unity that will be realized *per vinculum caritatis in aeterna gloria*? To contemplate the union of the Mystical Body is to contemplate the consummating mission of the Holy Spirit—*ratio finiendi*.

In other words, the threefold structure of the Eucharist reveals the Trinitarian life of God—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—through creation, the Body and Blood of Christ, and the unity of the Church. Concurrently, the structure of the Eucharist follows the trinitarian design of salvation history: creation, Incarnation, salvation in glory. As such, the dynamic structure of the Eucharist ultimately facilitates contemplation of, inasmuch as it culminates in, the finality of charity—the finality of the Holy Spirit. In this Sacrament, the human pilgrim *in via* is offered a taste of the charity of the Spirit that perfects the Church *in gloria*.

Vatican II famously identified the Eucharist as the "fount and apex of the whole Christian life."[261] I would propose to expand this description. Theology should speak of the Eucharist not only as fount and apex, but as fount, center, and apex: the Eucharist recapitulates creation (*sacramentum tantum*), Incarnation (*res et sacramentum*), and ultimate union (*res tantum*). The Eucharist reveals the semiotic depths of creation, that "in the beginning" (Gen 1:1) God wrote the beginning of a story that would flourish

---

[261] *Lumen gentium*, §11.

sacramentally. Sacraments remind us that creation fosters intimacy with the Creator. The Eucharist then reveals that in the "fullness of time" (Gal 4:4) God became man in the Incarnation. In Christ, the *perfectio universi*, humanity is prepared anew for *salus*. Christ grabs hold of humanity, weakened by sin, in order then to send humanity forward in the freedom of the Spirit. Thus the Eucharist does not terminate with Christ, but in mystery mediated by his immaculate flesh: in the Holy Spirit "who is charity and is had by charity," in the Holy Spirit—*unitas caritatis*—who builds up the Mystical Body, the unity of which will be consummated in glory *per vinculum caritatis* in accord with what the Lord prayed: "that they may be one" (Jn 17:22).

CONCLUSION

1. Concluding Synthesis: Unity in Love

This study has brought attention to, highlighted, and ultimately explicated the finality of the Holy Spirit in St. Bonaventure's theology.

Bonaventure teaches that the Holy Spirit, the *ratio terminantis complementi*, "terminates" the divine persons.[1] The Holy Spirit brings the dynamic of love to completion. This dynamic eternally "begins" with the Father, *principium totius divinitatis*, and by dint of the Father's firstness (*primitas*), his fontal fullness is totally and infinitely self-diffusive. He begets a Son *ut dilectus*,[2] the middle person of the Trinity—a dyad, however, that is incomplete without the *complementum*[3] of love. Indeed, without spiration, generation remains incomplete.[4] This *complementum* is the *unitas caritatis*[5] that is the Holy Spirit, who brings love to its perfection.[6]

The Spirit is thus the *ratio tertii*[7] in whom "completive unity"[8] is eternally realized. In this *nexus—unio consequens distinctionem*[9]—Father and Son are eternally "conjoined (*coniunguntur*)"[10] in a perfect union of love: "For it is necessary that those who are distinct and altogether similar [i.e., the Father and the Son] be conjoined through delightful love [i.e., the Holy

---

[1] *Hex.*, 1.12 (5:331b).
[2] *I Sent.*, d. 6, au., q. 2, resp. (1:128a).
[3] *Hex.*, 1.12 and 21.4 (5:331b and 432a).
[4] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 2, fund. 1 (1:197a).
[5] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 2, a. 2, fund. 9 (5:65a).
[6] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 1, fund. 1 and ad 4 (1:194b-195a and 196b); *Hex.*, 11.12 (5:282a).
[7] *I Sent.*, d. 11, au., q. 1, ad 3 (1:213a); *I Sent.*, d. 12, au., q. 4, ad 1 (1:226a).
[8] *I Sent.*, d. 11, au., q. 2, ad 2 (1:216a).
[9] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 2, q. 2, ad 3 (1:203a).
[10] *I Sent.*, d. 11, au., q. 1, resp. (1:211b-212a).

Spirit]."[11] The Holy Spirit is the "*concordia* of unity [→ the Father] and equality [→ the Son]."[12]

Bonaventure's trinitarian theology culminates in Love, the "unity of charity," the "embracing love (*spirationem amoris complectentis utrumque*)"[13] of the Holy Spirit. The *complementum* is *complectens*. To contemplate the finality of the Holy Spirit in the inner life of the Holy Trinity is to contemplate unitive love—it is to contemplate unity realized in love: "The nature of a *nexus* begins from distinction and tends or leads into unity: whence the ultimate and completive meaning (*ultima et completiva ratio*) is unity."[14]

This perfection and completion of Love illuminates the whole story of creation, the *decursus mundi*—a beautiful and well ordered *carmen*. In the fullness of time, the Father sends his beloved Son. Christ, the center person of the Holy Trinity, is the center of history. And his reparative mission culminates pentecostally in the Spirit *qui caritas est*.[15] Christ prepares us anew *ad salutem*, which consists in "having the highest good," namely God: and to have God is to enter into relationship with the Trinity as son/daughter of the Father, spouse of Christ, and temple of the Holy Spirit. This relational constellation hinges on the gift of grace, "with which and in which is given the Holy Spirit,"[16] "whom whoever has, has also God."[17]

Christ's mission culminates in Love, in the Spirit he sends so that his ecclesial Body might be consummated in the same *unitas caritatis* that brings the divine dynamic to its own perfect *extremum*: "'I in them, and you in me, so that they may be consummated into one' [Jn 17:23], that is, perfected in the unity of charity."[18] Thus the Mystical Body of Christ is consummated *per vinculum caritatis*[19]—the Eucharist, which mystery mediates the gift of

---

[11] *I Sent.*, d. 13, au., q. 3, resp. (1:236b).
[12] *Brev.*, 1.6.3 (5:215a).
[13] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 5, a. 2, ad 9 (5:96ab).
[14] *I Sent.*, d. 11, au., q. 2, ad 2 (1:216a).
[15] *Brev.*, 4.10.8 (5:252a).
[16] *Brev.*, 5.1.2 (5:252a).
[17] *Brev.*, 5.1.4 (5:253a).
[18] *In Ioann.*, 17.39 (6:475a).
[19] *Brev.*, 5.8.4 (5:262a).

charity (*ardentissimam caritatem*),[20] the gift with which the uncreated gift of Charity is always given.[21]

In St. Francis, the Church in pilgrimage is given a taste of the eschatological future. Bonaventure perceives in this "man of peace"[22] the *ordo seraphicus*, and thus the kind of contemplative union totally sustained by the "consolation of the Holy Spirit …. And in this the Church is consummated."[23] Francis, bearer of the sign of God in the stigmata, is sealed with the "sign of charity,"[24] "sealed by the Holy Spirit."[25] Thus, totally inflamed by the Holy Spirit, Francis reveals the way to pass-over *cum Christo crucifixo ex hoc mundo ad Patrem*: *transitus* by the fire of the Holy Spirit (*ignis Spiritus sancti*).[26]

In sum, the finality of the Holy Spirit accentuates that, for the Seraphic Doctor, *ordo* culminates in love, in the union of love. Grounded in the divine order of the Triune God, the structure of created being itself is thus ordered toward love, ultimately toward the mystical *transitus* of the human creature. The finality of the Holy Spirit reveals that being is thus not enclosed: *to be* involves stretching forth into the other (*tendere in alium*), because being *is* trinitarian in its very design. In other words, this dynamic movement toward unity in love does not only pertain to the Holy Trinity, wherein the Father and the Son love one another by—in the spiration of—the Holy Spirit. It is also the movement of created being and the story of creation which begins "in the beginning" (Gen 1:1). The drive toward the fullness of actuality is the movement toward the fullness of love (*complementum*). "Thus, love is at the heart of any movement of every being, both created or uncreated being."[27] All of reality finds its ultimate meaning and perfection in love.

For the Seraphic Doctor, then, the Holy Spirit plays an essential role in the overall shape of his theological vision. It is not just that Bonaventure has a rather refined pneumatology. Such a statement is too weak. For

---

[20] *Brev.*, 6.9.3 (5:274b).
[21] *In Ioann.*, 20.53 (6:515b); *I Sent.*, d. 18, a. 1, q. 1, resp. (1:323b).
[22] *Itin.*, prol. 1 (5:295a).
[23] *Hex.*, 22.22 (5:440b-441a).
[24] *Hex.*, 23.14 (5:447a).
[25] *Hex.*, 23.10 (5:446b).
[26] *Itin.*, 7.4 and 7.6 (5:312b and 313b).
[27] Hellmann, *Divine and Created Order*, 182.

Bonaventure, the Holy Spirit is the very culmination of his whole theology. In other words, Bonaventure's theology does not merely include pneumatological treatments and aspects; rather, the very shape of his theology as a whole is incomplete without it.

2. Moving Forward

What might such a pneumatological perspective mean for both the study of St. Bonaventure and, more generally, for the life of the Church today? To answer this question, I draw attention to five specific developments of this study:

1) Bonaventure's theology of the Spirit's procession provides a helpful framework for contemplating the Triune God. Bonaventure frames procession in terms of a *principium a quo* and a *terminus ad quem*: this framework is a fitting context to think theologically of the *filioque* (from the Father into the Son and from the Son into the Father), the ultimate return to the Father (through the Son) and thus the circularity of divine life, as well as the relation between generation and spiration (inasmuch as the identity of the Son implicates the breath of Love from the Father). Furthermore, Bonaventure's pneumatology of gift illuminates not only the essential openness to be given that is characteristic of divinity—a perspective that is *unique* to Christianity—but also the essential giftedness of created being. How can Bonaventure's pneumatology engage with and be a source for contemporary systematic treatments of the Trinity?[28]

2) While Bonaventure's theological vision manifests a robust and governing Christocentrism, exclusive focus on Christ the Center—divorced from the mediating significance of his centrality—misses the point. This study has nuanced and amplified the significance of the centrality of Christ. Yes, Bonaventure's theology *is* Christocentric; but that means it *therefore* exhibits pneumatic finality. Christ's mission is a mediating mission. Christ's

---

[28] Throughout this study, I have at times referenced the work of contemporary systematicians (e.g., Luis Ladaria, Nicholas Lombardo, Joseph Ratzinger/Benedict XVI, Etienne Vetö). More work is needed in this area, namely, making Bonaventure's voice available to contemporary theologians and inserting Bonaventure's thought into contemporary discussions. His voice should not be confined to medievalists and specialists.

mission blossoms in the mission of the Holy Spirit, in whom the fullness of his own mission lies: in the salvific body that is the Church, in the mystery of the grace of the Holy Spirit that "descends from the Father of lights through the Incarnate Word,"[29] in the sacramental economy—the "fruit" of which is the *cura et salus* of humanity.[30] Christ is the center turning point in the *decursus mundi*, which finds its *ultimum* in the *plenitudo bonitatis* of glory. To restrict Christ's centrality to Christ alone is to diminish the significance of his mission as mediation. How might this perspective shed further light on other aspects of Bonaventure's theology?[31]

3) Accordingly, the Holy Spirit is not peripheral to theology and the spiritual life in general. Indeed, as Bonaventure remarks, "no one comes to the Son except through the Holy Spirit."[32] Theology cannot content itself with peripheral remarks to the Holy Spirit. To enter into the fullness of the Christian experience is to be "inflamed by the fire of the Holy Spirit."[33] For Bonaventure, St. Francis demonstrates this reality: he lived ever attentive to and receptive of the inspiring movement of the Holy Spirit.[34] The fundamental structure of Christian existence is thus "pneumatic in form," as I had argued in the final chapter of this study. Christ's *reparatio* draws us into the mystery of a filial relation with God, which filial relation is consummated by the Holy Spirit. Christ sets us "free … in the mission of the Spirit."[35] Christian discipleship is life in the freedom of the Spirit. In this regard, the insight of Romano Guardini, the great bonaventurean pioneer of the 20th century, is most fitting: the Christian category "in Christ" is a pneumatic category.[36] Is this pneumatological orientation sufficiently reflected in catechesis and preaching today?

---

[29] *Brev.*, 5.2 (5:252a).

[30] *Brev.*, 6.6 (5:265b-266a).

[31] For example, promising in this regard may be further reflection on Bonaventure's Christology of the *triplex verbum*—the Uncreated, Incarnate, and Inspired Word. This Christological framework seems to evince pneumatic finality in and of itself. It is not that the Inspired Word *is* the Holy Spirit; yet, the Inspired Word is utterly bound up with the Holy Spirit. See Begasse de Dhaem, "Il *triplex verbum* bonaventuriano," 343-347. I also think of the conclusion of the *Lignum vitae*, which is a prayer for the gifts of the Holy Spirit (46 [8:86ab]).

[32] *Red. art.*, 26 (5:325b).

[33] Francis of Assisi, *LtOrd* 50 (*FAED* 1:120).

[34] See *LMj.*, 10.2 (8:533ab).

[35] *Sermo 43*, §1 (*SD*:426).

[36] See his *Das Wesen des Christentums* (Würzburg: Werkbund-Verlag, 1953), 53-54.

4) The feasts of Ascension and Pentecost therefore deserve more attention in the liturgical year. The Ascension is not *just* Christ's departure. It is the preparation for the descent of the Holy Spirit, whom he promised to his disciples. Pentecost culminates the mission of the Incarnate Word. Accentuating the intrinsic connection between Ascension and Pentecost, and thus between Pentecost and the mission of Christ as a whole, would only foster a richer and fuller participation in the celebration of these mysteries. Does today's liturgical celebration of Pentecost adequately manifest its significance?

5) Also in terms of the liturgy: this study has exposed and explicated the pneumatic finality, and the eschatological thrust in general, of the Eucharist—*vinculum caritatis*. This perspective does not diminish but rather accentuates the significance of the true presence of the Body and Blood of our Lord. The true Body and Blood is not only reality (*res*) but also sacrament (*sacramentum*): it thereby points beyond itself. As *res et sacramentum*, it mediates the *res tantum* that is the union of the Mystical Body. Eucharistic theology, if it only focuses on the true Body and Blood of Christ as *res*, thus underappreciates the fullness and depth of Christ's presence. For Bonaventure, the *unum significatum ultimum*[37] (= *res tantum*) of the Eucharist is the union of the Mystical Body, which union the charity of the Holy Spirit realizes. As such, the Eucharist prepares us for, inasmuch as it offers a foretaste of, that eschatological union consummated *in aeterna gloria*.[38] Eucharistic spirituality is thus not only Christocentric, but fundamentally open to the gift of the Spirit and the charity that unites us to one another. How might this pneumatological vision enrich devotion to and participation in Eucharist today?

---

[37] *IV Sent*., d. 8, p. 2, a. 2, q. 2, ad 2 (4:198ab); see also ad 4 (4:198b).
[38] *Brev*., 5.8.4 (5:262a).

3. A Concluding Admonition

In 1974, during a conference celebrating the 700th anniversary of Bonaventure's death, Pope Saint Paul VI delivered an address at the Seraphicum in Rome. He concluded with an admonition:

> What else is St. Bonaventure's message ultimately if not an invitation to man to recover his entire authenticity and reach his fullness? We entrust this message to you who, by community of religious profession or consonance of ideas, are more directly heirs of the Seraphic Doctor, so that you may investigate his riches and spread his acceptance. *Yet we also recommend him to all the children of the Church*, exposed today—perhaps more than ever—to a process of inner decomposition, so that serious consideration of him may help each [person] to make of their life a valid and efficacious testimony in the Church and in the world.[39]

Paul VI perceived in Bonaventure a theological vision that both propels the human person toward fullness of life and that counteracts, overcomes, and provides an alternative to the decomposition of interior life. He thus entrusted Bonaventure to the children of the Church.

In further explicating and making available the synthesis of the Seraphic Doctor, this study is another small step toward realizing Paul VI's admonition. There is yet much work to be done. May the Holy Spirit guide us on the way.

O quam bonus et suavis est Spiritus tuus in nobis, Domine!
Wisdom 12:1[40]

---

[39] "Discorso del Santo Padre Paolo VI durante la visita al 'Seraphicum' in onore di San Bonaventura," §4, emphasis mine.

[40] *In Luc.*, 18.37 (7:461b); *Sermo 25*, §9 (*SD*:312)

Ideo Pater, quia generat (*I Sent*., d. 27)

This appendix analyzes an important question that arises in distinction 27 of Bonaventure's *Commentarius in Primum Librum Sententiarum*, namely: "Whether generation is the principle (*ratio*) of paternity, or the other way around."[1] In other words, is the Father the Father because he generates, or does he generate because he is the Father? As Friedman has shown, the different ways of answering this question are indicative of what he calls "the parting of the ways between the Dominican and Franciscan trinitarian traditions" that will emerge in the 13th century.[2] "At issue is the order of priority among our concepts of persons, relations, and emanations: are we to think that the persons are distinct because one emanates from another, or does distinction arise and emanation follow?"[3] The question about the relationship between paternity and generation puts this "dispute into sharp relief."[4]

I attend to this question not only, however, because of its theological importance, but also because Bonaventure's response was and is controversial. Accordingly, in addition to contributing to the theological landscape hitherto explored, examining Bonaventure's response to this question will allow me to engage critically with some recent interpretations of his theology of the Father.

---

[1] *I Sent*., d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 2 (1:468). Obviously, the discussion has nothing to do with chronology or a temporal sequence in God. It has to do with logical priority and posteriority, and more specifically how to understand, conceptually and coherently, the personal relations and distinctions of the three divine persons.

[2] Friedman, *Intellectual Traditions*, vol. 1, 72.

[3] Friedman, *Intellectual Traditions*, vol. 1, 72.

[4] Friedman, *Intellectual Traditions*, vol. 1, 73.

I now offer an overview of Bonaventure's position: that generation is the principle of paternity.[5] In the course of my analyis I will engage with two contemporary interpretations, namely Friedman's use of the term "proto-Father" and a critique put forth by Emmanuel Durand.

3.1 *Fundamenta and Response*

The question begins with three *fundamenta*.

- *Fund.* 1 affirms, together with the Lombard: "The Son always is, because he is always begotten." Just as passive generation accounts for the Son's sonship (*ratio essendi filium*), so active generation should account for the Father's paternity (*ratio essendi patrem*).[6]
- *Fund.* 2 argues similarly. "To be generated" is prior than "to be," and "to be" is prior than "to be referred (*referri*)." Hence "to be generated" is prior than "to be son." By the same reason, "to generate" is prior than "to be father."[7]
- *Fund.* 3 changes the approach, but only slightly. It states that the "hypostasis of the Father is father." This affirmation obtains either because the hypostasis is *Deus* or *Deus generans*. The former does not hold because it would apply also to the Son, but *Deus generans* picks out determinately the hypostasis of the Father.[8] Active generation dovetails with the very identity of the Father (= God generat*ing*). Taken as a whole, then, the arguments connect the hypostasis of the Father with the act of generation. They thereby block attempts to sever the Father from the act of generation.

---

[5] A thorough explication exceeds the scope of this study. For a most helpful presentation of Bonaventure's position, and how it differs from Aquinas, see Friedman's first chapter "The Makings of a Trinitarian Controversy: Aquinas and Bonaventure on Relations, Emanations, and Personal Distinction" in his *Intellectual Traditions*, vol. 1, 50-89, especially 72-88. Cf. Jordan Daniel Wood, "The Father's Kenosis: A Defense of Bonaventure on Intratrinitarian Acts," *Pro Ecclesia: A Journal of Catholic and Evangelical Theology* 30 (2021): 3-31; Krueger, "God the Father in the Western Tradition," 264-277; Woźniak, *Primitas et plenitudo*, 146-151.

[6] *I Sent.*, d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 2, fund. 1 (1:468b).

[7] *I Sent.*, d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 2, fund. 2 (1:468b-469a).

[8] *I Sent.*, d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 2, fund. 3 (1:469a).

In his response to the question, Bonaventure first observes that the opinion surrounding this topic is twofold. The first opinion, put forth by Albert the Great and later upheld by Aquinas, argues that paternity is the principle of generation: he generates because he is the Father. This position grants that, in creatures, act (*actus*) establishes the relation: e.g., a father is a father because he generates. Relations in God, however, function differently. The relation—in this case: paternity—grounds the act—in this case: generation. Hence, "the Father generates, because he is Father."[9]

Bonaventure does not find fitting this solution. He thus puts forth a second opinion, which he endorses, namely: he is Father, because he generates. As he had argued in the *fundamenta*, Bonaventure explains that the Son is who he is thanks to being generated. The act of generation is determinative of sonship. So, too, says Bonaventure, in the case of the Father.[10] Indeed, as Friedman asks: "How could the Son be established as a person distinct from the Father prior to the emanation of the Son from the Father? What role could generation possibly play in God if it were the case that it did not establish the Son as a person distinct from the Father?"[11] In other words, if act does not ground the relationship, then what is the content of the relationship? If paternity is conceptually prior to generation, then it would seem that the Father's paternity can be conceptually grasped without reference to his eternal act of generation. But what is paternity without the sonship that comes from it?

Bonaventure then goes on to say that the difference between "generation" and "to be father," in terms of what they point out, makes the case clear: generation indicates origin, and paternity indicates reference (*habitudinem*).[12] Yet origin is the principle of reference. Hence generation, Bonaventure concludes, is the principle (*ratio*) of paternity.[13]

---

[9] *I Sent.*, d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 2, resp. (1:469ab).

[10] See *I Sent.*, d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 2, resp. (1:469b).

[11] Friedman, *Intellectual Traditions*, vol. 1, 74-75.

[12] He is implicitly referring to the previous question. The two terms are the same *secundum rem*, but in terms of their precise signification, they differ. See *I Sent.*, d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 1, resp. (1:468ab).

[13] See *I Sent.*, d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 2, resp. (1:469b). See also *I Sent.*, d. 26, au., q. 3, resp. (1:458a): "But it should be noted that, since it is the same for the divine persons to be born and to be and to be related to another (*oriri et esse et ad alterum se habere*), nonetheless

The nucleus of the Seraphic Doctor's position, however, finds expression in his responses to the contrary arguments, and most especially in his response to the third.

3.2 *Response to Contrary Argument 1*

The first contrary argument claims that there is no generation without a distinct person who generates; this person who generates is distinguished by paternity. To respond, Bonaventure agrees that, in the order of understanding, generation ensues when there is a distinct person. He then specifies, however, that this does not mean we need to understand beforehand the person "distinct by the act, because the person is distinguished through the property of generation by a complete distinction."[14] In other words, while we need to posit a hypostasis that generates, a minimal grasp of that hypostasis suffices. We do not need to conceive of that hypostasis in its complete distinction per generation.

Even though act is the basis of the complete distinction of the first hypostasis, Bonaventure's point here is that it suffices that the Father be distinguished—as the hypostasis which generates—thanks to innascibility. In terms of our understanding, "the principle of distinguishing is begun (*inchoatur*) in innascibility, and therefore he generates, not as first distinct by paternity, but as in a certain way by innascibility."[15] Later, Bonaventure writes similarly: "the distinction of the person of the Father is begun (*inchoatur*) in innascibility and it is consummated (*consummatur*) in paternity."[16] Paternity is the consummate expression of innascibility.

Bonaventure thus preserves the importance of generation, which the opposing viewpoint struggles to do. In effect, the alternative position would

---

according to the reason of understanding (*rationem intelligendi*), they are ordered, such that first is to be born (*primum sit oriri*), and then to be (*esse*) is understood in those who have being from another, and then to be related to another (*se ad alterum habere*). But because they are the same in God, they are designated by the same name. Whence generation bespeaks origin and relation (*originem et habitudinem*); although properly speaking, generation bespeaks origin and the relation of paternity." It is origin and so emanation that ultimately makes distinct the persons. See Friedman, *Intellectual Traditions*, vol. 1, 76-77.

[14] *I Sent.*, d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 2, ad 1 (1:469b).
[15] *I Sent.*, d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 2, ad 1 (1:470a).
[16] *I Sent.*, d. 28, dub. 1 (1:504b).

need to offer an account of paternity abstracted or isolated from active generation. Moreover, as will continue to be made clear, for the Seraphic Doctor the Father *is* source. Bonaventure unequivocally accounts for this feature. At the same time, his trinitarian ontology keeps intact the intrinsic relationality of divine life: no divine person is constituted without being-in-relation.[17]

3.3 *Response to Contrary Argument 2*

The second contrary argument affirms that paternity, in God, cannot be acquired through an act. In fact, Bonaventure agrees: no property in God is acquired. According to the order of understanding, though, origin is the principle of relation.[18] Then Bonaventure affirms that the act of generation is eternal, and thus the property of paternity is eternal. It is not, therefore, acquired through an act, but it does inhere (*inest*) through the act.[19] Relations are *in act*. As Bonaventure states explicitly in his *De mysterio Trinitatis*, the Father generates and "is that generation."[20] Metaphysically, then, generation and paternity are thus eternally inseparable in the "eternal Father."[21]

Bonaventure's point at this juncture is crucial. If the agent and the act are eternal, then ipso facto the metaphysics at play here will not line up very well with the kind of metaphysics descriptive of secondary causality, wherein an agent precedes act. In this regard, I think that Jordan Wood is right to accentuate the neoplatonic background of Bonaventure's position. Wood argues that it is not aristotelian "horizontal causality" that informs Bonaventure's opinion, but a more neoplatonic "vertical causality."[22] "The

---

[17] It is impossible that the fontal plenitude of the Father lacks the actuality of fontal productivity. The *primitas* of the first person cannot intelligibly be isolated from the fecund emanations of the second and third persons.

[18] See *I Sent.*, d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 2, ad 2 (1:470a).

[19] "Whence just as the act of generation is eternal, thus also is the property of paternity eternal. Whence, although it is not acquired through act, it nonetheless inheres through the act (*inest per actum*)." *I Sent.*, d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 2, ad 2 (1:470a). Bonaventure also offers an alternative argument: certain habits, he admits, do elicit acts—such as grace which elicits meritorious works. Paternity, however, does not elicit the act of generation.

[20] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 3, a. 2, resp. (5:76a).

[21] *Itin.*, prol., 1 (5:295a).

[22] "Horizontal" and "vertical" causality are Wood's terms from his "The Father's Kenosis."

First," states Wood, drawing from Plotinus and others, "cannot act like other acts."[23] To posit a first actor who then acts obstructs the deep identity between the actor and the act. Within this framework, a proper interpretation of the Seraphic Doctor's theology—*ideo Pater, quia generat*—requires a certain interpenetration of the Actor and the act. The term *Deus generans*, implied by *primitas*, accentuates this interpenetrative identity. To dislocate the act from the actor does violence to Bonaventure's theology of the *primum*.[24] There is not an actor *who then* acts. There is instead the Actor, whose personal property (*paternitas*) inheres (*inest*) *per* the eternal act. Accordingly, for Bonaventure, the relative property suffices to distinguish the person, but only insofar as it implies both reference and origin.[25]

It would also be helpful, at this point, to turn for a brief moment to Bonaventure's treatment of eternity in the *De mysterio Trinitatis* (q. 5). The second article needs to show that the production of persons in God does not jeopardize divine eternity. Emanation of the Son and the Spirit, however, would only threaten eternity *if* there was a before and after in God—which

---

[23] Wood, "The Father's Kenosis," 18. In a pithy passage, Wood writes: "Plotinus cannot bring himself to say, even improperly, that the One's power to act in anyway *precedes* its actualization, as he admits provisionally of Intellect. He says instead that when the One's 'hypostasis is, as it were, its activity,' then this act is not referred back to its prior 'substance' or power, 'but its quasi-substance coexists and, so to speak, is ever generated together with its activity, and it itself makes itself from both, for itself and from nothing.' Plotinus' own peculiar version of the *causa sui* entails that, should we (improperly) speak of the First actor's act, it could only be in such a way that the First act simultaneously actualizes and so manifests the very power of that act. Actor comes with act, act with actor; actor is constituted by act, act by actor. The Neoplatonic First 'actor,' quite contrary to Thomas' Father, must possess no prior power to act" (20). While I appreciate Wood's insight here, I disagree with his conclusion. Like Delio (see n42 in Part One, Chapter One above), Wood concludes by describing the Father as kenotic: "the Father is only himself by being nothing for himself and everything in and for and as another. The paternal act is essential kenosis" (26). My concern with the use of "kenosis," discussed above, applies here, as well. In a word, kenosis does not capture the superlative meaning of fontal fullness, which is infinitely infinite—excessive—in its realization and actuality.

[24] "If therefore the divine power is most powerful (*virtus est potentissima*), …; it follows that it is capable to produce (*potens producere*) and does produce (*producet*), so that what is produced is simultaneous in nature with the one producing." *Myst. Trin.*, q. 5, a. 2, fund. 3 (5:94a).

[25] "[Bonaventure] claims that if we take the relative property to indicate reference alone, then it is only the basis on which we know (*ratio innotescendi*) the person to be distinct; if we take the relative property to mean both origin and reference, then it is both the basis on which we know the person to be distinct and the basis on which the person is made distinct." Friedman, *Intellectual Traditions*, vol. 1, 77. Friedman is commenting on *I Sent.*, d. 26, au., q. 3, resp. (1:458a).

there is not.[26] The act of generation is eternal: the Son is always coming forth from the Father who is always begetting the Son.[27] Hence the mutual relations of the persons are eternal.[28] Divine eternity reveals itself as an eternal embrace of coeternal love: an eternal giving of life to the Son by the Father in the "embracing love" of the Spirit.[29]

3.4 *Does Innascibility Infer a Proto-Father?*

I now turn to Friedman's use of the term "proto-Father." He introduces this term to explain how Bonaventure can account for "a potentiality for generation in the supposite that will be the Father 'after' the generation of the Son. That is to say, there must be a type of 'proto-Father' from which generation comes."[30] Friedman avers, then, that "Bonaventure's notion of primity [i.e., *primitas*] ... fills this need."[31] Furthermore, commenting on Bonaventure's response to the first contrary argument, Friedman writes:

---

[26] Note the distinction between two types of *productio* and *acceptio* at *Myst. Trin.*, q. 5, a. 2, ad 10 (5:96b): "it should be said that, just as there is a certain production, in which *produci* and *productus esse* differ; and there is a certain [production], in which these two are the same; similarly reception (*acceptio*) is also said in two ways: in one way, in which *accipere* and *accepisse* differ, but in another way, in which they are the same; the first way corresponds to the first type of production, and the second to the second. The objection is true with regard to the first case, but not with regard to the second case; and in this way the Son from the Father *accipi esse*. For he always has received and always receives (*accepit et semper accipit*), because the Father always generates and has always generated (*semper generat et semper genuit*)." The contrary argument had concluded that the Son, insofar as he receives being from the Father, did not therefore have being before receiving it; so there must be a beginning. Bonaventure utilizes this distinction between two types of *productio/acceptio* to respond. In brief, regarding the Son, no difference surfaces between receiving-being (*accipere*) and having-received-being (*accepisse*). They interlace. It is not the case, then, that the Son receives what he once did not have, but that he is always—eternally—receiving who he is from the Father. See also *Myst. Trin.*, q. 5, a. 2, ad 5 (5:95b).

[27] See *Myst. Trin.*, q. 5, a. 2, ad 5 (5:95b); *Myst. Trin.*, q. 5, a. 2, ad 6 (5:95b). Hence there is a "coaeternitatem producentium et productorum" (*Myst. Trin.*, q. 5, a. 2, ad 3 [5:95b]). See also Bonaventure's use of *coaeternitas* in *Itin.*, 6.2-3 (5:310b-311a).

[28] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 5., a. 2, fund. 9 (5:94b).

[29] "Because although the Father produced the Son according to his immense power (*secundum virtutem suam immensam*), he generates him, and does not spirate him; and thus according to another mode of producing, which is through spiration, there is a production of another person simultaneous with the Son, because those productions are not repugnant, but naturally connected (*naturaliter coannexae*). Just as it is clear in the mind, an actual intellectual consideration does not impede, but rather induces that the affection is brought in the good (*feratur in bonum*) that is known and seen; so neither does the generation of the Word proceeding from the mind impede the spiration of love embracing both (*spirationem amoris complectentis utrumque*)." *Myst. Trin.*, q. 5, a. 2, ad 9 (5:96ab).

[30] Friedman, *Intellectual Traditions*, vol. 1, 79.

[31] Friedman, *Intellectual Traditions*, vol. 1, 79.

"speaking conceptually, the property of innascibility gives a certain amount of being to the hypostasis that will be the person of the Father."[32]

While, as a whole, I find Friedman's study a remarkable and most helpful piece of scholarship, his choice of "proto-Father" to explicate *primitas* is less than adequate. Above all, the term inevitably conveys temporality. Even though Friedman accentuates that there is no temporal sequence, the term "proto-Father" cannot but entail a dense temporal connotation. It does not, in the final analysis, do justice to a more integrated analysis that would take into account Bonaventure's theology of trinitarian eternity. Indeed, "proto-Father" conceptually indicates potentiality,[33] but potentiality has no place in the Seraphic Doctor's theology on this topic: "eternal generation is always most actual and most complete (*actualissima et completissima*)."[34] Indeed, the power to act and the act itself interlock: there is identity between them because the *potentia* and the *actus* are eternal.[35] There is no potency to generate—but only eternally and infinitely actualized power. In this regard, a succinct passage from Luc Mathieu's analysis on the *ideo Pater, quia generat* discussion comes to mind:

> Said differently, the first person constituted inchoately by innascibility is completed in paternity. But one must not stop at considering the first person in an inchoate way, because all duration is excluded from the divine being, the tendency of the first person toward the second is eternally satisfied and actualized in the eternal generation of the Son.[36]

Furthermore, the term "proto-Father" effectively splits the person: it suggests, even if only conceptually, a pre-relational status of the first hypostasis. To this degree, the term straightforwardly misinterprets Bonaventure's theological vision. As emphasized in the first section of this chapter, *primitas* bespeaks fontality: it is fundamentally heterotelic. It connotes "inner dynamic communication," as Hellmann puts it.[37] One might

---

[32] Friedman, *Intellectual Traditions*, vol. 1, 81. On the same page: "Innascibility and primity serve to establish the hypostasis of the Father in 'proto-being' conceptually."
[33] See Friedman, *Intellectual Traditions*, vol. 1, 79-80.
[34] *Myst. Trin.*, q. 5, a. 2, ad 11 (5:96b). See also *I Sent.*, d. 9, au., q. 3 (1:184-185); *Hex.*, 11.11 (5:381b-382a).
[35] See *Myst. Trin.*, q. 5, a. 2, fund. 8 (5:94ab).
[36] Mathieu, "Introduction," 21.
[37] Hellmann, *Divine and Created Order*, 54.

even say that it corresponds to a metaphysically kinetic impulse or feature in the first hypostasis: fontal springing forth of life. Like the gushing source of a river, the Father cannot be contained in himself. *Primitas* will not allow it. *Primitas* in God bespeaks alterity in God. In other words, being first (*primitas*!) *is* being-productive (i.e., *Deus generans*) and this productivity *is* infinite in act: generative of the Son and spirative of the Spirit.

3.5 *Response to Contrary Argument 3*

The third contrary argument states that the act of generation belongs to the Father alone. It belongs to the Father alone because he is either "God" or "God the Father" or "[God] innascibile." The first option will not work, because that term can apply also to the Son; the third term will also not work out, because it is only a negation. Thus, the Father generates, because he is God the Father.

To respond, Bonaventure takes the opportunity to offer a lengthy treatment clarifying his theology of innascibility/*primitas*. In light of the first section of this chapter, which focused on *primitas*, I will not here offer a detailed analysis of his response. A broad overview will suffice.

Bonaventure maintains, as he had earlier, that innascibility is not a mere negation. "For innascibility," he explains, "is said of the Father, because he is not from another; and not to be from another is to be first (*esse primum*), and primacy (*primitas*) is a noble affirmation (*nobilis positio*)."[38] To be first, moreover, means there is a second (and a third). The primacy of the first divine person thus speaks to the generation of the second and spiration of the third.[39] Bonaventure then cites Augustine: "Pater est principium totius divinitatis, quia a nullo."[40] It is significant that Bonaventure will refer to this

---

[38] *I Sent.*, d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 2, ad 3 (1:470a).
[39] "For the first, by reason of being first (*ratione primi*), thus bespeaks a noble position and condition (*nobilem positionem et conditionem*) … because to the position of the first follows the position of the second. Whence because first, it is therefore principle (*quia primum, ideo principium*)." *I Sent.*, d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 2, ad 3 (1:470ab).
[40] *I Sent.*, d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 2, ad 3 (1:470b).

quotation also near the end of his treatment. His theology of *primitas* makes a strong case for the Father as source of divine life.[41]

Bonaventure then strengthens his position. He develops a list of reasons in his support: the teaching of the great doctors (*antiqua positio magnorum doctorum*),[42] the common opinion, the authority of St. Hilary, the opinion of the Philosopher (= *Liber de Causis*), as well as three arguments based on reason. For the sake of space, and to evade repetition, I consider only one of his supporting arguments, namely the first one taken from reason. I choose this specific argument because it serves as the basis of Durand's critique, to which I will attend below.

The argument begins with the claim that it is possible to conceive of the hypostases of the Father and the Son without understanding the Spirit. The idea is that it is possible to set the relation of procession aside, as it were, and keep the relation of generation. Then, Bonaventure extends the mental exercise, and says it is also possible to consider the Father without either of the other hypostases. This consideration drops not only the relation of spiration but also that of generation.[43] Bonaventure runs this thought experiment to articulate a kind of model of pagan knowledge of God: they can know God but not as Triune, and thus in a fundamentally incomplete way. "For," reasons Bonaventure, "we are able—without understanding the plurality of persons—to understand the divine nature and the one having it, and that he may not have it from another; and as such do the gentiles understand (*intelligunt*)."[44] Having arrived at some sort of conception of the divine nature, they are able to think of this nature more precisely in terms of a subject that has it. It is to think of the Father as nothing more than the subject

---

[41] Friedman, *Intellectual Traditions*, vol. 1, 80: "for both Bonaventure and Aquinas, the Father is the source ... of the Trinity, ... [but] for Bonaventure this means a great deal more than it does for Aquinas."

[42] It is not unlikely that Bonaventure is referring to teachers at Paris. In fact, the Quarrachi editors note variant readings: *magnorum doctorum*, *magistrorum doctorum*, *magistrorum*. Bonaventure was not the first to use the term *plenitudo fontalis* (see n19 in Part One, Chapter One above).

[43] "For just as it is possible to understand the hypostasis of the Father and the Son, without however understanding the hypostasis of the Holy Spirit, so it is possible that the hypostasis of the Father be understood, without any other person being understood. And if the Father were so understood, it would be understood with paternity not being understood." *I Sent.*, d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 2, ad 3 (1:471b).

[44] *I Sent.*, d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 2, ad 3 (1:471b).

of the divine nature. Bonaventure then goes on to posit that a pagan philosopher could even think of God, in this fashion, as capable of generating. The difficulty, however, lies in determining the property of this divine subject that grants generation. "I can discover," concludes Bonaventure, "nothing within that hypostasis that is not common, except that is to say *innascibilitas*. Therefore, if generation cannot belong to the divine nature through what is common, it has to belong to it through what is proper; yet that is innascibility."[45] To put it simpler, it would not be logically incoherent for a philosopher to ascribe generation to the divine subject; yet the only property he has to work with, so to speak, is that subject's innascibility.

Admittedly, the beginning of the argument may seem strange, but before attempting to explicate Bonaventure on this point, I shift gears and turn to Durand's critique.

3.6 *A Contemporary Critique of Bonaventure's Position*

In his article on God the Father published in the *Oxford Handbook of the Trinity*, Emmanuel Durand puts forth a critique of Bonaventure's theology of the Father. To conclude this section, then, I respond to Durand.

I begin with the text of Durand's critique, which I divide into two halves (*A* and *B*). He has just finished briefly introducing Bonaventure's positive conception of innascibility.

> [*A*.] For Bonaventure, then, the Father can be conceived of as a person in virtue of his primacy alone, the fact that he is not begotten by another. Like pagan monotheists then, "we can conceive of the divine nature and he who possesses it, even if we do not conceive of a plurality of persons."[46] This affects our Trinitarian theology, however, when we attempt to understand the Father in relation to the divine generation of the Son. To conceive of the Father as Father (eternally able to beget a consubstantial Son) no other property is available than that of innascibility, the fact that God does not receive his nature from another. This perspective leads to a trend that is prevalent in contemporary theology: the tendency to treat the person of the Father and the divine essence as coextensive notions, and to overlook thereby that the relation

---

[45] *I Sent.*, d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 2, ad 3 (1:471b). Special thanks to Dr. Timothy Noone who graciously helped me to understand this argument.

[46] The reference is to: *I Sent.*, d. 27, p. 1, au., q. 2, ad 3 (see n43 above).

to the Son is itself *constitutive* of the primary hypostasis of the Father
….

[*B.*] The theory of Bonaventure then poses a serious problem: if the simple fact that God possesses a nature that he does not receive from another suffices to give intelligibility to a notion of divine generation (unbegottenness implies fecundity), then knowledge of the existence of the Trinity could seemingly be deduced simply from a property of the divine essence, one accessible to philosophers and pagan monotheists.[47]

To Durand's credit, Bonaventure's position at *I Sent.*, d. 27 was controversial also in his own epoch.[48] Nonetheless, Durand's analysis remains overly simplistic. He seems to prioritize a sound bite, rather than taking into account the nuances of a medieval scholastic like Bonaventure. In brief, I evaluate the critique as ungenerous in its interpretation, which leads to exaggerated conclusions.[49]

I respond first to the content in *A* above. The first sentence is potentially misleading: it does not specify that the Father can be conceived only inchoately in virtue of his primacy. Bonaventure is clear: "Therefore with paternity not understood, that person is not able to be understood by a complete distinction."[50] Durand's successive quotation of Bonaventure is interesting: it is Durand's only direct quote, yet it hardly expresses a central teaching of Bonaventure's trinitarian theory. Bonaventure is attempting to construe an argument based on reason; he is running a thought experiment—not offering a key synopsis of his position. At any rate, strictly speaking, it would be difficult to disagree with the words of the quotation. Afterall, non-Christian monotheists confess belief in the one God, without a plurality of

---

[47] Emmanuel Durand, "The Theology of God the Father," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity*, eds. Gilles Emery and Matthew Levering (Oxford – New York: Oxford University, 2011), 371-386 at 378.

[48] It was controversial in large part because Bonaventure took a stance different from Alexander of Hales. Bonaventure obviously took the charge seriously. See, e.g., the *Additamentum* published in the Quaracchi edition in the *Scholion* (1:473a-474b) and the *Praelocutio in II Sent.* (2:1a-3b). Edward Synan has argued that the *Praelocutio* is in fact a letter written by Bonaventure to a Franciscan community. See his "A Bonaventurian Enigma: 'Praelocutio' or 'Epilogus'? A Third Hypothesis," in *Bonaventuriana: Miscellanea in onore di Jacques Guy Bougerol ofm*, vol. 2, ed. Francisco de Asís Chavero Blanco (Rome: Edizioni Antonianum, 1988), 493-505.

[49] In contrast, Friedman's analysis of both Thomas and Bonaventure is more helpful. Appreciative of the nuanced and complex theology of both doctors, Friedman attempts to interpet them as coherently as possible in order to show how their frameworks and conclusions differ.

[50] *I Sent.*, d. 28, dub. 1 (1:504b).

persons. Bonaventure, moreover, also has a complex epistemology that accounts for this phenomenon: it is the difference between *semiplene* and *plene resolvens*.[51]

Significantly, in *I Sent.*, d. 28, au., q. 3, Bonaventure concludes that paternity is the personal notion of the Father. His response to a contrary argument in that treatment is most relevant. The contrary argument had claimed that, without understanding paternity, it would be possible to understand "the one having divinity and innascibility." Thus, the argument concludes, paternity is not the personal property, because innascibility suffices to pick out the supposit.[52] To respond, Bonaventure states that, in terms of a full understanding (*intellectu plene apprehendente*), the person of the Father without paternity cannot be understood. A philosophical grasp of innascibility is not enough to specify the Father.[53]

Durand then arrives at the heart of what I have identified as *A*'s critique: Bonaventure's position lends itself to identifying the Father with the divine essence (as coextensive notions) and to downplaying the constitutive relationality the Father shares with the Son. Once again, however, these conclusions do not take into consideration a more holistic view of the Seraphic Doctor's theology. Suffice it to say that Bonaventure is consistent: the act of generation—a power that maps on not to the nature *simpliciter*, but to the nature *ut in persona*[54]—communicates the essence. The one generating,

---

[51] See *Hex.*, 11.10 (5:381b) and *I Sent.*, d. 28, dub. 1 (1:504ab).

[52] *I Sent.*, d. 28, au., q. 3, opp. 2 (1:501a).

[53] "To that which objected, that it is to understand the person of the Father etc.; it should be said that by understanding that is fully apprehending (*intellectu plene apprehendente*) and rationally proceeding (*rationabiliter procedente*), it is not to understand the person or the hypostasis of the Father without paternity; because if he is understood as innascible, in such a way that paternity is not present, then innascible bespeaks a privation and does not say anything regarding the Father (*circa Patrem*) which it does not say regarding the essence (*circa essentiam*); and therefore it is not understood as a personal property, nor is it another, and therefore the person of the Father as distinct or as that hypostasis is not understood. For the property of innascibility, as a property, includes the properties and relations with respect to the principle (*respectu principiati*); otherwise, as was shown above, it is not a property." *I Sent.*, d. 28, au., q. 3, ad 2 (1:501b-502a). I also note that at *Brev.*, 1.3.7 (5:212a), Bonaventure affirms that "'innascibility' designates him [the Father] through the mode of a negation, although as a consequence (*ex consequenti*) through the mode of an affirmation …; 'principle not from a principle,' through the mode of affirmation with a negation; 'to be Father,' through the mode of affirmation and of relation (*per modum positionis et habitudinis*), properly, completely and determinately (*proprie, complete et determinate*)."

[54] *I Sent.*, d. 7, dub. 5 (1:145ab). It is the essence that is communicated by the person; see, e.g., *Myst. Trin.*, q. 3, a. 2, ad 12 (5:78a).

however, is the incommunicable person.[55] Also significant: Bonaventure will specify different ways in which *ingenitus* can refer to a) the Father, the Spirit, and the divine essence; b) the Father and the Spirit—but not the divine essence; and c) the Father alone.[56]

Does Bonaventure's theory, however, threaten to undermine relation to the Son as constitutive of the Father's hypostasis? As I have noted above, the very meaning of *primitas* itself blocks any attempt to isolate the Father from the Son or Spirit.[57] Fontal fecundity sinks into unintelligibility without the Father's actual fecund emanation of the Son and Spirit. In fact, Bonaventure's theology of *summa actualitas* entails the Word's generation and the Spirit's spiration.[58] If Bonaventure privileges act more than *relatio*, it does not diminish the intrinisc relationality of divine life.[59] Without entering into an unnecessary digression, I also point to Bonaventure's theology of *circumincessio*, which he describes as the *cointimitas* of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.[60] Divine persons are perichoretic persons.

In response to *B*, Durand's remark that Bonaventure's theory poses a serious problem does not—once again—take into account important elements of his thought. Most importantly in this regard, Bonaventure thinks that without revelation, and in particular the revelation of the New Testament, the human person cannot arrive at knowledge of the Holy Trinity.[61] To the extent, moreover, that a pagan monotheist can arrive at an innascibile divinity, Bonaventure qualifies this knowledge: it is only *semiplene* and cannot arrive at the Father's fontal plenitude.[62]

In sum, Durand's critique does not offer a fair reading of the Seraphic Doctor. His critique leads to questionable conclusions both about the content of Bonaventure's thought and its implications. Even if Durand, in the end,

---

[55] See, e.g., *I Sent.*, d. 9, au., q. 2-3 (1:182-185).

[56] See *I Sent.*, d. 28, au., q. 1, resp. (1:498ab).

[57] See n17 above.

[58] See *Myst. Trin.*, q. 6, a. 2, resp. (5:104ab).

[59] Indeed, without paternity, Bonaventure does not think we can arrive at a complete distinction of the Father. See *I Sent.*, d. 28, dub. 1 (1:504ab) and n53 above.

[60] *Itin.*, 6.2 (5:311a). See also *I Sent.*, d. 19, p. 1, au., q. 4 (1:347-349); *Hex.*, 21.2 (5:431ab). Regarding the doctrine of *circumincessio*, see n40 in Part One, Chapter One of this study.

[61] See, e.g., *Myst. Trin.*, q. 1, a. 2, resp. (5:54b-56b); *Itin.*, 5.2 (5:308b); *I Sent.*, d. 3, au., q. 4, resp. (1:76b).

[62] See *I Sent.*, d. 28, dub. 1 (1:504ab).

disagrees strongly with Bonaventure's position, it would have been more appropriate to offer a generous reading, one that tries to consider the nuances and make a case for its coherency, and then make an evaluation and point out deficiences or tensions.

Notes on the Influence of Odo Rigaldus on Bonaventure

An important task facing bonaventurean studies is, to be sure, uncovering and highlighting the sources—especially the proximate sources—of his thought. While the *Summa Halensis* is certainly important in this regard, the influence of Odo Rigaldus, a Friar Minor who became Master at Paris in 1245, on Bonaventure has yet to be established—in large part because of the lack of critical editions.[1] The goal of this brief appendix is to shed but a sliver of light on the influence of Odo Rigaldus on Bonaventure; my focus is on a few elements from *I Sent*., d. 10.

It is not my intention to go into detail explicating Odo's thought, but merely to draw attention to some interesting similarities. What follows is very much a preliminary investigation that merely lays some initial groundwork. In so doing, it thereby invites more research in this area.

1. Nature and Will

Like Bonaventure, Odo Rigaldus ties generation to the perfection of nature and the procession of the Holy Spirit to the perfection of will.

> Oportet quod sicut ex perfectione naturae est quod generat Filium, ita ex perfectione voluntatis quae est summa liberalitatis, oportet aliquid procedere ab eo per modum doni sive in ratione doni; sed hoc dicimus Spiritum Sanctum qui procedit quomodo datis. (Ms. 824 Troyes, fol. 25ra)

---

[1] Principe has already shown that Odo may be a precursor to Bonaventure's use of *effectus formalis* to interpret the phrase: "Pater et Filius diligunt se Spiritu sancto." See his "Odo Rigaldus, A Precursor of St. Bonaventure on the Holy Spirit as *effectus formalis* in the Mutual Love of the Father and Son," *Mediaeval Studies* 39 (1977): 498-505.

Furthermore, these two emanations—as in Bonaventure—are also linked to the theology of the good as self-diffusive:

> Ad oppositum praedictorum, scilicet quod debeat esse tertia persona in divinis, arguitur sic: bonum est sui diffusivum, ergo maxime bonum maxime est sui diffusivum; sed duo sunt principia diffundendi[2]: natura et voluntas. Ergo aut maxime bonum non maxime diffundet se aut utroque modo debet se diffundere. Ergo sicut se diffundit modo naturae in generando Filium, sic se debuit diffundere modo voluntatis spirando aliquam personam. Sed hanc dicimus Spiritum Sanctum. Ergo Spiritus Sanctus debuit esse tertia persona in divinis. (Ms. 824 Troyes, fol. 25ra)

2. The Primacy of Love

Not only Bonaventure, but also Odo dealt with the objection that, if a procession is granted on account of love, then there should be other processions that index to other habits or affections.[3] In treating this objection, Odo stresses the primacy of love:

> Ad tertiam quaestionem dicendum quod desiderium appetitus et huiusmodi quae quodam modo sonant in absentiam delectabilis et ita imperfectionem non dicuntur proprie de Deo; similiter nec iocunditas nec delectatio sive gaudium ita proprie sicut amor quia illa non sunt principalia, sed quasi a posteriori se habent respectu amoris et creantur ab amore.[4] Ex hoc enim creantur iocunditas et gaudium quod habemus quod amamus. Amor enim, quia est quasi principium habitus concupiscibilis et magis sonat perfectionem[5] quam alii, magis transumitur in divinis. (Ms. 824 Troyes, fol. 25va)

---

[2] In the manuscript, "diffundendi" is not so clear. It makes, however, the most logical sense. I am checking my own transcription with Ms. Paris, BNF 14910. Special thanks to Mark Clark and Timothy Noone for sharing with me their transcription of the parisian manuscript.

[3] Ms. 824 Troyes, fol. 25ra: "Item cum virtutis concupiscibilis multi sint habitus, sicut desiderium dilectio gaudium et huiusmodi, quaeritur quare amor magis transumitur ad hoc ut approprietur in divinis quam aliquis aliorum habitum." I did not treat this objection and Bonaventure's response in this study. See *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 2, ad 4 and ad 5.6 (1:198b).

[4] There is a word that comes after "ab" and before "amore," but I cannot quite make it out. The text makes sense without it, and it is not present in Ms. Paris, BNF 14910.

[5] The text says "imperfectionem" (as does Ms. Paris, BNF 14910) but that is likely an error. The argument makes sense with "perfectionem." Because love bespeaks "perfection" more so than the other affections, then for that reason it can be predicated of God.

Bonaventure calls love an "affectus intimus et primus et nobilissimus, quia origo omnium aliorum."[6] An emanation according to another affection would not be fitting, then, because only love is "principalis." Again: "Affectio enim amoris est prima inter omnes affectiones et radix omnium aliarum."[7]

3. Theology of *ordo*

Throughout this study, Bonaventure's theology of *ordo* has been emphasized. A notion of *ordo* also exists in Odo in *I Sent.*, d. 10. Significantly, he uses the term to describe the role, as it were, of the Holy Spirit as the *tertia persona*. In other words, the third person is third because he is third in the ordered life of God. Bonventure's approach to *ordo* is similar: the first, the second, and the third each have a unique role relative to their place in order. Here is the relevant text in Odo:

> Propter hoc dicunt magistri nostri quod iste nexus magis dicitur in ratione principiati quam in ratione medii. Unde sicut duo homines dicuntur uniri in aliquo effectu procedente ab ipsis, ita dicitur Spiritus Sanctus nexus Patris et Filii; et tamen intelligitur ille nexus sicut procedens ab utroque. Et propter hoc semper intelligitur Spiritus Sanctus sicut tertia persona, nec potest dici quod quaelibet persona in divinis posset dici persona tertia, sicut si hic essent tres homines, quilibet eorum posset dici tertius incipiendo computationem ab aliis sicut solet dici quod hoc verbum 'est' praedicatur tertium adiacens, quod tamen semper medium est per rem. Hoc enim quod dico tertium prout dicimus tertia persona non solum dicit numerum sed etiam ordinem, et ratione illius ordinis solus Spiritus Sanctus potest dici persona tertia. (Ms. 824 Troyes, fol. 26ra)

4. *Donum in quo omnia alia dona donantur*

As I noted in this study, Bonaventure uses this phrase—rooted in the Augustinian tradition—more than once. He clearly likes it.[8] The theology of the phrase is thus not unique to Bonaventure. Indeed other thinkers use a similar phraseology.

---

[6] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 2, ad 5.6 (1:198b).
[7] *I Sent.*, d. 10, a. 1, q. 2, resp. (1:197b).
[8] See n196 in Chapter Three of Part One of this study.

Peter Lombard adopts this pneumatology of gift, thus securing its influence in the later medieval tradition. In his words:

> Hic quaeritur, cum Spiritus Sanctus, per quem dividuntur dona, ipse sit donum, utrum concedendum sit quod per donum dividantur ac dentur dona. - Ad quod dicimus quia per donum quod est Spiritus Sanctus singulis propria dividuntur, et ipsum communiter omnes boni habent. Unde Augustinus in XV libro *De Trinitate* ait: 'Per donum quod est Spiritus Sanctus in commune omnibus membris Christi, multa dona quae sunt quibusque propria dividuntur. Non enim singuli quique habent omnia, sed hi illa, alii alia, quamvis ipsum donum, a quo cuique propria dividuntur, omnes habeant, id est Spiritum Sanctum.' Aperte dicit per donum dona dari.[9]

As is clear from the passage, the pneumatology of gift has strong roots in St. Augustine. One notes, however, that the Lombard does not have the specific phrase *in quo omnia alia dona donantur*. Neither does William of Auxerre, although he gets quite close: "Spiritus Sanctus est donum in quo omnia dona donantur."[10] The *Summa Halensis* gets even closer: "in illo omnia alia dona donantur," "primum donum quo omnia alia dantur," "Spiritus Sanctus est donum in quo omnia alia dona dantur."[11] And Albert the Great has: "Spiritus sanctus est donum in quo alia dona donantur: et in hoc dono dantur dona."[12] They are all drawing from the same Augustinian tradition, all putting forth a similar pneumatology of gift.

What is interesting though is that Bonaventure's slightly different phrase (*in quo omnia alia dona donantur*) is found verbatim in Odo's own commentary of distinction 10. Odo:

> Quod concedimus: dicimus etiam quod necesse fuit ut summum bonum diffunderet se et modo naturali et modo voluntario, nec esset ibi perfectio summae liberalitatis nisi a Deo procederet aliquid in ratione Doni; primum autem et potissimum donum, et etiam [donum] *in quo omnia alia dona donantu*r est amor, sicut vult Augustinus; et ideo oportuit ut aliquid procederet in ratione amoris, qui est praecipuum

---

[9] Peter Lombard, *I Sent*., lib. 1, d. 18, c. 1 (ed. Brady, 1:152-153).

[10] *Summa Aurea*, lib. 2, tract. 1, c. 1 (ed. Jean Ribaillier [Grottaferrata: Collegii S. Bonaventurae ad Claras Aquas, 1982], 13).

[11] *SH* I, n. 511 (1:728b).

[12] Albert the Great, *I Sent*., d. 18, a. 1, sol. (*Opera omnia*, vol. 25, *Commentarii in I Sententiarum (Dist. I-XXV)*, ed. Augusti Borgnet [Paris: Bibliopolam Editorem, 1893], 491b.

donum.[13] Et sicut nullus generat seipsum, ita et nullus primo et proprie dat se ipsum. Unde oportuit donum distingui ut ille amor donum distingueretur ab ipso dante. (Ms. 824 Troyes, fol. 25rb)[14]

It would thus seem that Bonaventure took this phrase from Odo.

5. Conclusion

This brief appendix has touched upon certain places in Odo that would appear to anticipate or influence Bonaventure's own theology, especially as worked out in *I Sent*., d. 10. Obviously, much more research would be needed to establish Odo's influence on Bonaventure. Yet, at the very least, this appendix lays the basic groundwork to make the case that such research would yield postive results.

---

[13] Cf. Bonaventure, *I Sent*., d. 15, p. 2, au., q. 2, fund. 2 (1:272a): "Spiritus sanctus, quia praecipuum donum…"

[14] The phrase *in quo omnia alia donantur* is also in Ms. Paris, BNF 14910 28rb.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Works (Bonaventure)

Bonaventure. *Opera Omnia*. 10 vols. Edited by the Quaracchi Friars. Quaracchi: Ex Typographia Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1882-1902.

————. *Collationes in Hexaëmeron et bonaventuriana quaedam selecta*. Edited by Ferdinand Delorme. Ad Claras Aquas: Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1934.

————. *Sermones Dominicales*. Edited by Jacques Guy Bougerol. Grottaferrata: Collegio S. Bonaventura, 1977.

————. *Sermons de Diversis*. 2 vols. Edited by Jacques Guy Bougerol. Paris: Les Editions Franciscaines, 1993.

Primary Works (Other)

Albert the Great. *Opera omnia*. Vol. 25, *Comentarii in I Sententiarum (Dist. I-XXV)*. Edited by Augusti Borgnet. Paris: Bibliopolam Editorem, 1893.

Augustine. *In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus CXXIV*. Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 36, Edited by R. Willems. Turnholt: Brepols, 1954.

————.*Confessionum Libri XIII*. Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 27. Edited by L. Verheijen. Turnholt: Brepols, 1981.

————. *De Trinitate Libri I-XII*. Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 50. Edited by W. J. Mountain and F. Glorie. Turnholt: Brepols, 2001.

————. *Epistulae I-LV*. Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 31. Edited by K. D. Daur. Turnholt: Brepols, 2004.

Bartholomaeus de Barberiis. *Cursus theologicus ad mentem Seraphici Doctoris S. Bonaventurae*. 2 vols. Lyons, 1687.

Bernard of Clairvaux. *Sancti Bernardi Opera*. Vol. 1, *Sermones super Cantica Canticorum: 1-35*. Edited by J. Leclercq, C. H. Talbot, H. M. Rochais. Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1957.

————. *Sancti Bernardi Opera*. Vol. 8, *Epistolae*. Edited by J. Leclercq and H. Rochais. Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1977.

Doctoris irrefragabilis Alexandri de Hales Ordinis minorum Summa Theologica. Vol. 1-4. Quaracchi: Ex Typographia Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1924-1948.

Francis of Assisi. *Francisci Assisiensis Scripta*. Edited by Carlo Paolazzi. Grottaferrata: Collegii S. Bonaventurae ad Claras Aquas, 2009.

Fulgentius of Ruspe. *Opera II.* Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 91A. Edited by J. Fraipont. Turnholt: Brepols, 1968.

John Damascene. *De Fide Orthodoxa: Versions of Burgundio and Cerbanus*. Edited by Eligius M. Buytaert. St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 1955.

Peter Lombard. *Sententiae in IV Libris Distinctae*. Vol. 1-2. Grottaferrata: Collegii S. Bonaventurae Ad Claras Aquas, 1971 and 1981.

Richard of Saint Victor. *De Trinitate*. Edited by Jean Ribaillier. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1958.

———. *Opuscules Théologiques*. Edited by Jean Ribaillier. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1967.

Pattin, Adriaan. "Le *Liber de Causis*: Édition Établie À L'Aide de 90 Manuscrits avec Introduction et Notes." *Tijdschrift voor Filosofie* 28 (1966): 90-203.

William of Auxerre. *Summa Aurea*. Vol. 1, *Liber Primus*. Vol. 2, *Liber Secundus*. Edited by Jean Ribaillier. Grottaferrata: Collegii S. Bonaventurae ad Claras Aquas, 1980, 1982.

Primary Works In Translation Used or Consulted

Armstrong, Regis J., J. A. Wayne Hellmann and William J. Short, eds. *Francis of Assisi: Early Documents*. Vol. 1, *The Saint*. New York: New City Press, 1999.

Bonaventure. *Into God: Itinerarium Mentis in Deum of Saint Bonaventure. An Annotated Translation*. Translated and annotated by Regis J. Armstrong. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2020.

———. *Collations on the Hexaemeron. Conferences on the Six Days of Creation: The Illuminations of the Church*. Translation, Introduction, and Notes by Jay M. Hammond. Works of St. Bonaventure 18. St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 2018.

———. *Bonaventure: On the Eucharist (Commentary on the Sentences, Book IV, dist. 8-13)*. Introduction, Edition, and Translation by Junius Johnson. Dallas Medieval Texts and Translations 23. Leuven – Paris – Bristol, CT: Peeters, 2017.

———. *Commentary on the Sentences: Sacraments*. Translation, Introductions, and Notes by J.A. Wayne Hellmann, Timothy R. LeCroy and Luke David Townsend. Works of St. Bonaventure 17. St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 2016.

———. *Breviloquium*. Introduction, Translation, and Notes by Dominic V. Monti. Works of St. Bonaventure 9. St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 2005.

———. *Disputed Questions on the Mystery of the Trinity*. Introduction and Translation by Zachary Hayes. Works of St. Bonaventure 3. St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 2002.

———. *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke*. Introduction, Translation, and Notes by Robert J. Karris. Works of St. Bonaventure 8 (3 parts). St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 2001, 2002, 2004.

———. *Collations on the Ten Commandments*. Introduction and Translation by Paul J. Spaeth. Works of St. Bonaventure 6. St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 1995.

Ephrem the Syrian. *The Hymns of Faith*. Translated by Jeffrey T. Wickes. The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation 130. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 2015.

Plotinus. *Ennead*, *Volume VI: 6-9*. Translated by A. H. Armstrong. Loeb Classical Library 468. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1988.

Manuscripts

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Médiathèque de Troyes Champagne Métropole, Ms. 824, fol. 24v-26r.

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Latin Ms. 14910, fol. 27v-29r.

Secondary Literature

Abbate, Stefano. "Iglesia consumada, san Francisco y orden franciscana. La esperanza intrahistórica según san Buenaventura." *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 114 (2021): 585-604.

Aertsen, Jan. *Medieval Philosophy as Transcendental Thought: From Philip the Chancellor (ca. 1225) to Francisco Suárez*. Boston – Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Álvarez, Elena. *Procede del Padre y del Hijo. Estudio de la Clarificación Romana de 1995 y de sus fuentes patristicas*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2011.

de Armellada, Bernardino. "Medium." In *Dizionario Bonaventuriano*, 549-552.

Baldner, Stephan. "St. Bonaventure on the Temporal Beginning of the World." *New Scholasticism* 63 (1989): 206-228.

Begasse de Dhaem, Amaury. *Mysterium Christi. Cristologia e soteriologia trinitaria*. Assisi: Cittadella Editrice, 2021.

———. "Gesù Cristo, mistero trinitario." In *La Trinità in dialogo. La dimensione trinitaria della teologia*, edited by Sergio Paolo Bonanni and Dariusz Kowalczyk, 45-60. Roma: Gregorian and Biblical Press, 2020.

———. "Il *triplex verbum* bonaventuriano: cristocentrismo trinitario e singolarità/universalità della salvezza." In *Deus summe cognoscibilis*, 333-351.

———. "La sacra Scrittura, anima della teologia. Dall'esegeta-teologo al teologo-esegeta." *Gregorianum* 99 (2018): 247-269.

Begasse de Dhaem, Amaury, Enzo Galli, Maurizio Malaguti, Rafael Pascual and Carlos Salto Solá, eds. *Deus Summe Cognoscibilis: The Current Theological Relevance of Saint Bonaventure*. Leuven – Paris – Bristol: Peeters, 2018.

Beschin, Giuseppe. "Exemplar." In Caroli, *Dizionario Bonaventuriano*, 367-380.

Benedict XVI. *Jesus of Nazareth*. Part 2, *Holy Week: From the Entrance Into Jerusalem to the Resurrection*. Translated by the Vatican Secretariat of State. San Francisco: Ignatius, 2011.

Benson, Joshua. "The Christology of the *Breviloquium*." In Hammond et al., *A Companion to Bonaventure*, 247-287.

Bohm, David. *Unfolding Meaning: A Weekend of Dialogue*. London: Routledge, 1985.

———. "The Implicate Order: A New Approach to the Nature of Reality." In Schindler, *Beyond Mechanism*, 13-37.

———. *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*. London – New York: Routledge Classics, 2002.

Bonanni, Sergio Paolo. "Il 'Filioque' tra dialettica e dialogo. Anselmo e Abelardo: posizioni a confronto." *Lateranum* 64 (1998): 49-79.

———. "*Generatio est ratio communicandi essentiam*: La teologia trinitaria di Bonaventura da Bagnoregio alla luce del suo commento alla V *distinctio* del I *Sententiarum* di Pietro Lombardo." In Begasse de Dhaem et al., *Deus Summe Cognoscibilis*, 571-590.

Bonansea, Berardino. "The Question of an Eternal World in the Teaching of St. Bonaventure." *Franciscan Studies* 34 (1974): 7-33.

Bougerol, Jacques Guy, ed. *Lexique Saint Bonaventure*. Paris: Éditions Franciscaines, 1969.

—————, ed. *S. Bonaventura 1274-1974*. Vol. 4, *Theologica*. Grottaferrata: Collegio S. Bonaventura, 1974.

Brambilla, Paolo. "Lo Spirito agisce nella storia secondo la sua identità personale di dono e amore. Una lettura del *Commento alle Sentenze* di Bonaventura." *La Scuola Cattolica* 147 (2019): 229-256.

Brown, Benjamin. "Bonaventure on the Impossibility of a Beginningless World: Why the Traversal Argument Works." *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 79 (2005): 389-409.

Cantalamessa, Raniero. *Il canto dello spirito. Meditazioni sul Veni creator*. Milano: Àncora Editrice, 1997.

Caroli, Ernesto, ed. *Dizionario Bonaventuriano*. Padova: Editrici Francescane, 2008.

Casarella, Peter. "Trinity, Simultaneity, and the Music of Creation in St. Bonaventure." In *Time: Sense, Space, Structure*, edited by Nancy van Deusen and Leonard Michael Koff, 141-159. Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2016.

Catania, Francis. "John Duns Scotus on *Ens Infinitum*." *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 67 (1993): 37-54.

Chavero Blanco, Francisco de Asís, ed. *Bonaventura: Miscellanea in onore di Jacques Guy Bougerol ofm*. 2 vols. Roma: Edizioni Antonianum, 1988.

—————. "El hombre y su dimension de futuro. Para una relectura bonaventuriana." In Chavero Blanco, *Bonaventura*, vol. 1, 223-256.

—————. "Per una teologia e antropologia dell'immagine in san Bonaventura." *Doctor Seraphicus* 37 (1990): 5-35.

Chiarinelli, Lorenzo. "La vocazione dell'uomo: capace di Dio, beato in Dio." *Doctor Seraphicus* 56 (2009): 5-16.

Ciampanelli, Filippo. *«Hominem reducere ad Deum». La funzione mediatrice del Verbo incarnato nella teologia di san Bonaventura*. Roma: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2010.

Congar, Yves. *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*. Vol. 1, *The Experience of the Spirit*. Vol. 2, *Lord and Giver of Life*. Vol. 3, *The River of Life Flows in the East and in the West*. Translated by David Smith. New York – London: The Seabury Press – Geoffrey Chapman, 1983.

Coolman, Boyd Taylor. "Part II: 'On the Creation of the World,'" in Monti and Shelby, *Bonaventure Revisited*, 141-167.

———. "The Comprehensive Trinitarianism of the *Summa Halensis*." In Schumacher, *The Summa Halensis: Doctrines and Debates*, 107-139.

———. "Pneumatic Finality of Goodness in the *Summa Halensis*." In Johnson et al., *Saint Bonaventure: Friar, Teacher, Minister, Bishop*, 83-98.

Coyle, Justin. "Appropriating Apocalypse in Bonaventure's *Breviloquium*." *Franciscan Studies* 76 (2018): 99-136.

Cullen, Christopher. *Bonaventure*. Great Medieval Thinkers. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Daley, Brian. "Revisiting the 'Filioque': Roots and Branches of an Old Debate. Part One." *Pro Ecclesia: A Journal of Catholic and Evangelica Theology* 10 (2001): 31-62.

D'Ancona, Cristina. "The *Liber de causis*," in Gersh, *Interpreting Proclus*, 137-161.

Daniel, Emmett Randolph. "St. Bonaventure: Defender of Franciscan Eschatology." In Bougerol, *S. Bonaventura 1274-1974*, vol. 4, 795-806.

Delio, Ilia. "Bonaventure's Metaphysics of the Good." *Theological Studies* 60 (1999): 228-246.

Deneffe, Angust. "Perichoresis, circumincessio, circuminsessio." *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 47 (1923): 497-532.

Dettloff, Werner. "'Christus tenens medium in omnibus': Sinn und Funktion der Theologie bei Bonaventura." *Wissenschaft und Weisheit* 20 (1957): 28-42, 120-140.

Di Maio, Andrea. "L'agnello di Dio 'Pastor et Pastus' e la 'specialissima effigies et similitudo.' L'eucaristia tra simbologia e mistagogia in S. Bonaventura." *Doctor Seraphicus* 53 (2006): 7-42.

———. "Il problema della storia in Bonaventura." *Doctor Seraphicus* 63 (2015): 45-75.

Dourley, John. "The Relationship Between Knowledge of God and Knowledge of the Trinity in Bonaventure's *De mysterio Trinitatis*." In

San Bonaventura maestro di vita francescana e di sapienza cristiana, vol. 2, edited by Alfonso Pompei, 41-48. Rome: Pontifica Facoltà Teologica San Bonaventura, 1976.

Dreyer, Elizabeth. "'Affectus' in St. Bonaventure's Theology." *Franciscan Studies* 42 (1982): 5-20.

Durand, Emmanuel. "A Theology of God the Father." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity*, edited by Giles Emery and Matthew Levering, 371-386. Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Elsässer, Antonius. *Christus der Lehrer des Sittlichen. Die christologischen Grundlagen für die Erkenntnis des Sittlichen nach der Lehre Bonaventuras*. München – Paderborn – Wien: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, 1968.

Emery, Gilles. *La Trinité Créatrice: Trinité et création dans les commentaires aux Sentences de Thomas d'Aquin et de ses précurseurs Albert le Grand et Bonaventure*. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1995.

———. *The Trinitarian Theology of St. Thomas Aquinas*. Translated by Francesca Aran Murphy. Oxford – New York: Oxford University, 2007.

Ennis, Hyacinth J. "The Place of Love in the Theological System of St. Bonaventure in General." In Bougerol, *S. Bonaventura 1274-1974*, vol. 4, 129-145.

Esser, Kajetan. "Studium und Wissenschaft im Geiste des hl. Franziskus von Assisi." *Wissenschaft und Weisheit* 39 (1976): 26-41.

Fehlner, Peter. *The Role of Charity in the Ecclesiology of St. Bonaventure*. Rome: Miscellanea Francescana, 1965.

———. "Introduction." In *The Triple Way by St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio*. Translation, Commentary and Notes by Peter Fehlner, 1-94. New Bedford, MA: Academy of the Immaculate, 2012.

———. "Scotus and Newman in Dialogue." In *The Newman-Scotus Reader: Contexts and Commonalities*, edited by Edward J. Ondrako, 239-389. New Beford, MA: Academy of the Immaculate 2015 (Canonization Issue 2019).

Ferraro, Giuseppe. "Lo Spirito Santo nel Commento di san Bonaventura al Quarto Vangelo." *Antonianum* 49 (1974): 448-470.

Fresneda, Francisco Martínez. "Influentia." In Caroli, *Dizionario Bonaventuriano*, 492-501.

Freyer, Johannes B. "Der Hl. Geist als Band der Liebe nach Bonaventura." In *Das franziskanische Verständnis des Wirkens des Heiligen Geistes in Kirche und Welt*, edited by Herbert Schneider, 44-50. Mönchengladbach: B. Kühlen Verlag, 2005.

———. "Bonaventure's Anthropology and Ecclesiology as a Universal Approach Towards a Vision of a Globalized World." In *Words Made Flesh: Essays Honoring Kenan B. Osborne, O.F.M.*, edited by Joseph P. Chinnici, 123-149. St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 2011.

Friedman, Russel L. *Intellectual Traditions at the Medieval University: The Use of Philosophical Psychology in Trinitarian Theology among the Franciscans and Dominicans, 1250-1350*. 2 vols. Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2013.

Galli, Enzo. "Dal *triplex verbum* alla filiazione divina: Un tentativo di attualizzazione del pensiero cristologico di san Bonaventura." *Miscellanea Francescana* 118 (2018): 40-52.

Gatinois, Laurent. "*Ad portum aeternae felicitatis*. La fonction de l'Ascension du Christ dans la théologie de l'histoire de saint Bonaventure de Bagnoregio." *Etudes franciscaines*, n.s., 10 (2017): 117-130.

Gambetti, Fabio. "Cristo, centro della storia secondo san Bonaventura." *Doctor Seraphicus* 63 (2015): 129-158.

Gersh, Stephen, ed. *Interpreting Proclus: From Antiquity to the Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2014.

Gerson, Lloyd. "Plotinus's Metaphysics: Emanation or Creation?" *The Review of Metaphysics* 46 (1994): 559-574.

Ghisalberti, Alessandro. "La concezione della storia in san Bonaventura." *Doctor Seraphicus* 30 (1983): 81-94.

Gilson, Etienne. *The Philosophy of St. Bonaventure*. Translated by Dom Illtyd Trethowan and F. J. Sheed. London: Sheed & Ward, 1940.

Goff, Jared Isaac. *Caritas in Primo: A Study of Bonaventure's Disputed Questions on the Mystery of the Trinity*. New Bedford, MA: Academy of the Immaculate, 2015.

———. "Divine Infinity in Bonaventure's *Disputed Questions on the Mystery of the Trinity*." In *Ordo et Sanctitas: The Franciscan Spiritual Journey in Theology and Hagiography: Essays in Honor of J.A. Wayne Hellmann, O.F.M. Conv.*, edited by Michael Cusato, Timothy Johnson and Steven McMichael, 165-185. Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2017.

—————. "Part I: 'On the Trinity of God.'" In Monti and Shelby, *Bonaventure Revisited*, 97-139.

Gonzales, José Miguel San Martin. "Gratia." In Caroli, *Dizionario Bonaventuriano*, 438-449.

Grosse, Sven. "Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventure, and the Critiques of Joachimist Topics from the Fourth Lateran Council to Dante." In *A Companion to Joachim of Fiore*, edited by Matthias Riedl, 144-189. Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2018.

Guardini, Romano. *Die Lehre des heil. Bonaventura von der Erlösung*. Düsseldorf: L. Schwann – Druckerei U. Verlag, 1921.

—————. *Systembildende Elemente in der Theologie Bonaventuras*. Leiden: Brill, 1964.

Hainthaler, Theresia. "God the Father in the Symbols of Toledo: *fons et origo totius trinitatis*." *International Journal of Orthodox Theology* 1 (2010): 125-136.

Hammond, Jay. "Appendix: Order in the *Itinerarium mentis in Deum*," in Hellmann, *Divine and Created Order*, 191-271.

—————. "Contemplation and the Formation of the *vir spiritualis* in Bonaventure's *Collationes in Hexaemeron*." In *Franciscans at Prayer*, edited by Timothy Johnson, 123-165. Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2007.

Hammond, Jay M., J.A. Wayne Hellmann and Jared I. Goff, eds. *A Companion to Bonaventure*. Leiden –Boston: Brill, 2014.

Harrison, Verna. "Perichoresis in the Greek Fathers." *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 35 (1991): 53-65.

Hayes, Zachary. "Christology and Metaphysics in the Thought of Bonaventure." *The Journal of Religion* 58, Supplement (1978): 82-96.

—————. "Bonaventure: Mystery of the Triune God." In *The History of Franciscan Theology*, edited by Kenan B. Osborne, 39-125. St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 1994.

—————. "The Doctrine of the Spirit in the Early Writings of St. Bonaventure," in *Doors of Understanding: Conversations in Global Spirituality in Honor of Ewert Cousins*, edited by Steven Chase, 179-198. Quincy, IL: Franciscan Press, 1997.

—————. *The Hidden Center: Spirituality and Speculative Christology in St. Bonaventure*. St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 2000. Original copyright 1981.

Hellmann, J.A. Wayne. *Ordo: Untersuchung eines Grundgedankens in der Theologie Bonaventuras* (München – Paderborn – Wien: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, 1974). English Translation: *Divine and Created Order in Bonaventure's Theology*. Translated by Jay M. Hammond. St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 2001.

———. "Charity in the Church—Charity in the Eucharist." In *The Spirit and the Church: Peter Damian Fehlner's Franciscan Development of Vatican II on the Themes of the Holy Spirit, Mary, and the Church*, edited by J.I. Goff, C.W. Kappes and E. Ondrako, 247-256. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2018.

———. "Sacraments: Healing Unto Glory." In Johnson et al., *Saint Bonaventure: Friar, Teacher*, 9-23. St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 2021.

Hellmann, J. A. Wayne, and T. Alexander Giltner. "Part VI: 'On the Sacramental Remedy.'" In Monti and Shelby, *Bonaventure Revisited*, 245-272.

Hemmerle, Klaus. *Theologie als Nachfolge: Bonaventure – ein Weg für heute*. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder KG, 1975).

Herbel, Oliver. "Ratramus of Corbie, Paulinus of Aquileia, and Aeneas of Paris as Sources for Bonaventure's *Filioque* Arguments in the *Sentences*." *Franciscan Studies* 65 (2007): 87-105.

Howard, Thomas. *Chance or the Dance? A Critique of Modern Secularism*. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1969.

Hughes, Kevin. "Eschatological Union: The Mystical Dimension of History in Joachim of Fiore, Bonaventure, and Peter Olivi." *Collectanea Francescana* 72 (2002): 105-143.

Iammarrone, Giovanni. *La cristologia francescana: impulsi per il presente*. Padova: Messaggero di S. Antonio, 1997.

Iammarrone, Luis (Luigi). "La Trinidad." In *Manual de Teología Franciscana*. Edited by José Antonio Merino and Francisco Martínez Fresneda, 57-148. Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 2003.

———. "Imago – Vestigium." In Caroli, *Dizionario Bonaventuriano*, 482-491.

Iozzelli, Fortunato. "Il sermone *In cena Domini* di S. Bonaventura: 'Venite ad me omnes.'" *Doctor Seraphicus* 53 (2006): 43-66.

Johnson, Benjamin Luke. *The Embodiment of Charity: Bonaventure on the Eucharist and Marriage*. St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 2023.

Johnson, Timothy. "Dream Bodies and Peripatetic Prayer: Reading Bonaventure's *Itinerarium* With Certeau." *Modern Theology* 21 (2005): 413-427.

Johnson, Timothy, Katherine Wrisley Shelby and Marie Kolbe Zamora, eds. *Saint Bonaventure: Friar, Teacher, Minister, Bishop. A Celebration of the Eighth Centenary of His Birth*. St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 2021.

King, Ronald. "The Origin and Evolution of a Sacramental Formula: *Sacramentum Tantum*, *Res et Sacramentum*, *Res Tantum*." *The Thomist* 31 (1967): 21-82.

Kneepkens, Corneille H. "Transitivity, Intransitivity and Related Concepts in 12th Century Grammar: An Explorative Study." In *De ortu grammaticae: Studies in Medieval Grammar and Linguistic Theory in Memory of Jan Pinborg*, edited by G. L. Bursill-Hill, Sten Ebbesen and Kongrad Koerner, 161-189. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 1990.

Krueger, James. "God the Father in the Western Tradition: Bringing Augustine and Bonaventure into Conversation with Modern Theology." PhD diss., The Catholic University of America, 2014.

Kuhn, Annette and Guy Westwell. "Diegesis." In *Oxford Dictionary of Film Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University, 2012.

Ladaria, Luis. *The Living and True God: The Mystery of the Trinity*. Translated and revised by María Isabel Reyna and Liam Kelly. Miami: Convivium Press, 2010.

―――. "*Fons et origo*. Monoteísmo y 'monarquía' del Padre." In *Doctor honoris causa excmo. y revdmo. P. Luis F. Ladaria Ferrer*, 39-53. Salamanca: Universidad Pontifica de Salamanca, 2014.

Levri, Catherine. "The Prologue to the *Breviloquium*." In Monti and Shelby, *Bonaventure Revisited*, 73-95.

Lohfink, Gerhard. *Prayer Takes Us Home: The Theology and Practice of Christian Prayer*. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2020.

Lombardo, Nicholas. "The Return of the Holy Spirit to the Father: A Puzzle for Trinitarian Theology." *Louvain Studies* 44 (2021): 114-130.

———. "The 'Monarchy' of God the Father." *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 24 (2022): 324-351.

———. "Where Does the Holy Spirit Proceed *To*?" *International Journal of Systematic Theology*, 23, n. 4 (2022): 473-501.

Maio, María Teresa. "La eucaristía: Sacrificio, Sacramento y Viático según San Buenaventura." *Miscellanea Francescana* 101 (2001): 433-494.

———. "Sacramento de la Eucaristía: Sacrificio de oblación según San Buenaventura." in *Miscellanea Francescana* 102 (2002): 17-71

———. "L'eucaristia segno sacramentale ed efficace dell'unità della Chiesa nel pensiero di san Bonaventura." *Miscellanea Francescana* 105 (2005): 3-20.

Mathieu, Luc. "Introduction: La doctrine trinitaire de saint Bonaventure." In Bonaventure, *Breviloquium*, vol. 1, *La Trinité de Dieu*, 5-48. Paris: Editions Franciscaines, 1967.

———. "Primitas." In Bougerol, *Lexique Saint Bonaventure*, 109-110.

———. *La Trinità creatrice secondo san Bonaventura*. Translated by Paolo Canali. Milano: Edizioni Biblioteca Francescana, 1994.

———. "Circumincessio." In Bougerol, *Lexique Saint Bonaventure*, 33-34.

———. "Primitas." In Caroli, *Dizionario Bonaventuriano*, 627.

Mateo-Seco, Lucas Francisco. "The Paternity of the Father and the Procession of the Holy Spirit: Some Historical Remarks on the Ecumenical Problem." In *Rethinking Trinitarian Theology: Disputed Questions and Contemporary Issues in Trinitarian Theology*, edited by Robert J. Woźniak and Giulio Maspero, 69-102. New York – London: T&T Clark, 2012.

McEvoy, James. "Microcosm and Macrocosm in the Writings of St. Bonaventure." In Bougerol, *S. Bonaventura 1274-1974*, vol. 2, *Studia De Vita, Mente, Fontibus et Operibus Sancti Bonaventurae*, edited by Jacques Guy Bourgerol, 309-343. Grottaferrata: Collegio S. Bonaventura, 1974.

McGinn, Bernard. "The Abbot and the Doctors: Scholastic Reactions to the Radical Eschatology of Joachim of Fiore." *Church History* 40 (1971): 30-47.

———. "The Significance of Bonaventure's Theology of History." *The Journal of Religion* 58, Supplement (1978): 64-81.

————. "The Dynamism of the Trinity in Bonaventure and Eckhart." *Franciscan Studies* 65 (2007): 137-155.

Melone, Mary. *Lo Spirito Santo nel De Trinitate de Riccardo di S. Vittore*. Roma: Pontificium Athenaeum Antonianum, 2001.

————. "'*Donum in quo omnia alia dona donantur.'* Aspetti di teologia dello Spirito Santo in Bonaventura da Bagnoregio." *Ricerche teologiche* 17 (2006): 51-75.

————. "Circumincessio." In Caroli, *Dizionario Bonaventuriano*, 230-231.

————. "Spiritus Sanctus." In Caroli, *Dizionario Bonaventuriano*, 761-771.

————. "La recezione della teologia trinitaria di Riccardo di San Vittore nel *Commento alle Sentenze* di Bonaventura da Bagnoregio." In *Religioni et doctrinae. Miscellanea di studi offerti a Bernardino de Armellada in occasione del suo 80° compleanno*, edited by Aleksander Horowski, 141-174. Roma: Istituto Storico dei Cappuccini, 2009.

————. "Lo Spirito, dono di carità e guida alla verità, in san Bonaventura." *Doctor Seraphicus* 58 (2010): 57-73.

————. "La vita di Dio, *summa bonitas et caritas*, nel mistero della Trinità: il fondamento della comunione e della creazione." *Doctor Seraphicus* 62 (2014): 7-23.

————. "Figli della Trinità o figli del Padre?" In Begasse de Dhaem et al., *Deus Summe Cognoscibilis*, 605-625.

————. "'*Spiritus Sanctus facit nos similes illi summae Trinitati*.' La funzione intratrinitaria e l'agire salvifico dello Spirito nel pensiero di Bonaventura." In *Bonawenturiański System Myślenia. Pytanie o Aktualność, 1217-2017*, edited by Romuald Henryk Kośla, 121-142. Kraków: Calvarianum, 2018.

Milano, Andrea. "Anselmo d'Aosta e il problema trinitario." In *Il Concilio di Bari del 1098. Atti del Convegno Storico Internazionale e celebrazioni del IX Centenario del Concilio*, edited by Salvatore Palese and Giancarlo Locatelli, 187-229. Bari: Edipuglia, 1999.

Milne, Joseph. "Saint Bonaventure and the Divine Order of Creation." *Medieval Mystical Theology* 30 (2021): 17-36.

Monti, Dominic and Katherine Wrisley Shelby, eds. *Bonaventure Revisited: Companion to the Breviloquium*. St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 2017.

Natalini, Valentino. "La Carità e il dono della sapienza nella dottrina di san Bonaventura." In *Quaderni di spiritualità francescana*. Vol. 11, *La*

carità nella spiritualità francescana, 36-72. Assisi: Tipografia Porziuncola, 1965.

Nguyen, Dinh Anh Nhue. "Il cristocentrismo, il fondamento 'totale' della teologia e la prospettiva sapienziale." In Begasse de Dhaem et al., *Deus Summe Cognoscibilis*, 163-172.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Will to Power*. Translated by Walter Kaufmann and R. J. Hollingdale. New York: Vintage Books, 1968.

———. *The Gay Science*. Translated by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Vintage Books: 1974.

Noone, Timothy. "St. Bonaventure: *Itinerarium Mentis in Deum*." In *Debates in Medieval Philosophy: Essential Readings and Contemporary Responses*, edited by Jeffrey Hause, 204-213. New York: Routledge, 2014.

Obenauer, Klaus. *Summa Actualitas: Zum Verhältnis von Einheit und Verschiedenheit in der Dreieinigkeitslehre des heiligen Bonaventura*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1996.

Oltra, Miguel. "Introducción General: La santisima Trinidad y los dones del Espíritu Santo en san Buenaventura." In *Obras de san Buenaventura*, vol. 5, edited by Bernardo Aperribay, Miguel Oromi and Miguel Oltra, 1-86. Madrid: Biblioteca de autores cristíanos, 1948.

Oppes, Stéphane. "Homo." In Caroli, *Dizionario Bonaventuriano*, 457-464.

Pandolfi, Carmelo. "Le parole di Dio nella parola di Dio. Riflessioni sulle *Quaestiones disputatae de mysterio Trinitatis* di san Bonaventura." *Doctor Seraphicus* 64 (2016): 71-124.

Panteghini, Gabriele. "Teologia del verbo o teologia dell'incarnazione? Fondamenti e limiti del cristocentrismo bonaventuriano." In *Teologia e filosofia nel pensiero di S. Bonaventura. Contributi per una nuova interpretazione*, 9-54. Brescia: Morcelliana, 1974.

Piolata, Thomas. "*Unitas caritatis*: Explicating an Implicit Reference to the Spirit in Bonaventure's *Quaestiones disputatae de mysterio Trinitatis*." In *Ut bon(aventuriani)i fiamus. Studies in St. Bonaventure on the Occasion of the 800th Anniversary of His Birth*, edited by Miran Špelič, Nena Bobovnik and Jan Dominik Bogata, 133-149. Ljubljana – Rome: Založba UL – Edizioni Quarrachi, 2022.

———. "The Center Blossoms, Part 1: The Pneumatological Fruit of the Incarnate Word in Bonaventure's *Breviloquium*." *Franciscan Studies* 81 (2023): 195-235.

———. "The Center Blossoms, Part 2: The Spirit of Salvation in Bonaventure's *Breviloquium*." Forthcoming in *Franciscan Studies* 82 (2024).

Pompei, Rolando Alfonso. "L'eucaristia segno sacramentale dell'amore con cui Cristo si dona all'umanità." *Doctor Seraphicus* 53 (2006): 99-123.

Porro, Pasquale. "The University of Paris in the thirteenth century: Proclus and the *Liber de causis*." In Gersh, *Interpreting Proclus*, 264-298.

Prentice, Robert. *The Psychology of Love According to St. Bonaventure*. St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 1992.

Principe, Walter. "St. Bonaventure's Theology of the Holy Spirit With Reference to The Expression 'Pater et Filius diligunt se Spiritu sancto'." In Bougerol, *S. Bonaventura 1274-1974*, vol. 4, 243-269.

———. "Odo Rigaldus, A Precursor of St. Bonaventure on the Holy Spirit as *effectus formalis* in the Mutual Love of the Father and Son." *Mediaeval Studies* 38 (1977): 498-505.

Quinn, John F. "The Rôle of the Holy Spirit in Bonaventure's Theology." *Franciscan Studies* 33 (1973): 273-284.

Ratzinger, Joseph. "Der Mensch und die Zeit im Denken des Heiligen Bonaventura. Zugleich ein Beitrag zum Problem des Mittelalterlichen Augustinismus." In *L'Homme et son destin: d'après les penseurs du Moyen Âge*, 473-483. Louvain – Paris: Éditions Nauwelaerts – Béatrice-Nauwelaerts, 1960.

———. *The Theology of History in St. Bonaventure*. Translated by Zachary Hayes. Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1989.

———. "The Holy Spirit as *Communio*: Concerning the Relationship of Pneumatology and Spirituality in Augustine." *Communio: International Catholic Review* 25 (1998): 324-337.

———. "Allocution in conclusione sessionis plenariae Commissionis Theologicae Internationalis (8. X. 2004)." In Begasse de Dhaem et al., *Deus Summe Cognoscibilis*, 661-662.

Rezette, Jean Pierre. "Caritas." In Bougerol, *Lexique Saint Bonaventure*, 29-32.

Rizzacasa, Aurelio. "I sette giorni della creazione e le sette epoche della storia nelle *Collationes in Hexaëmeron* di san Bonaventura." *Doctor Seraphicus* 63 (2015): 77-92.

Rocco, Giuseppe. *L'antropologia in San Bonaventura*. Vicenza: Editrice Veneta, 2009.

Salto Solá, Carlos. "L'alimento che accende il desiderio di comunione: la dimensione trinitaria del sacramento della eucaristia secondo Bonaventura da Bagnoregio." In Begasse de Dhaem et al., *Deus summe cognoscibilis*, 521-533.

Salas, Victor. "Bonaventure on the Vanity of Being: Towards a Metaphysic of Ecclesiastes." *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 90 (2016):635-663.

Scarpelli Cory, Therese. "What Is an Intellectual 'Turn'? The *Liber de Causis*, Avicenna, and Aquinas's Turn to Phantasms." *Tópicos* 45 (2013): 129-162.

———. "*Reditio completa, reditio incompleta*: Aquinas and the *Liber de causis*, Prop. 15, On Reflexivity and Incorporeality." In *Appropriation, Interpretation and Criticism: Philosophical and Theological Exchanges Between the Arabic, Hebrew and Latin Intellectual Traditions*, edited by Alexander Fidora and Nicola Polloni, 185-229. Barcelona – Roma: Fédération Internationale des Instituts d'Études Médiévales, 2017.

Schaefer, Alexander. "The Position and Function of Man in the Created World According to Saint Bonaventure [Part 1]." *Franciscan Studies* 20 (1960): 261-316.

———. "The Position and Function of Man in the Created World According to Saint Bonaventure [Part 2]." *Franciscan Studies* 21 (1961): 233-382.

Scheffczyk, Leo. "The Meaning of the 'Filioque.'" *Communio: International Catholic Review* 13 (1986): 125-138.

Schindler, David, ed. *Beyond Mechanism: The Universe in Recent Physics and Catholic Thought*. Lanham: University Press, 1986.

Schlosser, Marianne. *Cognitio et amor: Zum kognitiven und voluntativen Grund der Gotteserfahrung nach Bonaventura*. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1990.

Schmitz, Kenneth L. "Temporal Integrity, Eternity and Implicate Order." In Schindler, *Beyond Mechanism*, 99-127.

Schoonenberg, Piet. *Man and Sin: A Theological View*. Translated by J. Donceel. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1965.

Schumacher, Lydia, ed. *The Summa Halensis: Sources and Context*. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 2020.

————, ed. *The Summa Halensis: Doctrines and Debates*. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 2020.

————, ed. *The Legacy of Early Franciscan Thought*. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 2021.

Shelby, Katherine Wrisley. "Part V: 'On the Grace of the Holy Spirit," in Monti and Shelby, *Bonaventure Revisited*, 215-243.

————. *Spiraling into God: Bonaventure on Grace, Hierarchy, and Holiness*. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America, 2023.

Siecienski, Edward. *The Filioque: History of a Doctrinal Controversy*. Oxford: Oxford University, 2010.

Šilić, Rufin. *Christus und die Kirche: Ihr Verhältnis nach der Lehre des heiligen Bonaventura* Breslau: Müller & Seiffert, 1938.

Simone, Stephanus. "De causalitate Eucharistiae in Corpus Mysticum doctrina S. Bonaventurae." *Antonianum* 8 (1933): 193-228.

Stohr, Albert. *Die Trinitätslehre des heiligen Bonaventura. Eine systematische Darstellung und historische Würdigung*. Münster: Verlag der Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1923.

Stringer, Clifton. "Supremely Simple Trinity and Contemporary Natural Theology: Bonaventure Beyond Jenson and Plotinus." *Pro Ecclesia: A Journal of Catholic and Evangelical Theology*, OnlineFirst, November 30, 2022.

Suarez-Nani, Tiziana. "On Divine Immensity and Infinity in Relation to Space and Time: The Crossroad of the *Summa Halensis*." In Schumacher, *Legacy of Early Franciscan Thought*, 71-87.

Sweeney, Leo. "Bonaventure and Aquinas on the Divine Being as Infinite." In *Bonaventure and Aquinas: Enduring Philosophers*, edited by Robert Shahan and Francis Kovach, 133-153. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1976.

Synan, Edward. "A Bonaventurian Enigma: 'Praelocutio' or 'Epilogus'? A Third Hypothesis." In Chavero Blanco, *Bonaventuriana*, 493-505.

Szabó, Titus. *De SS. Trinitate in creaturis refulgente doctrina s. Bonaventurae* (Rome: Orbis, 1955).

Thom, Paul. *The Logic of the Trinity: Augustine to Ockham*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2012.

Todisco, Orlando. "Il platonismo di Bessarione e di Bonaventura. Riflessi nella vicenda del 'Filioque.'" *Miscellanea Francescana* 119 (2019): 9-42.

Twombly, Charles. *Perichoresis and Personhood: God, Christ, and Salvation in John of Damascus*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2015.

Van Asseldonk, Optatus. "The Spirit of the Lord and Its Holy Activity in the Writings of Francis." Translated by Edward Hagman. *Greyfriars Review* 5.1 (1991): 105-158.

Van Nieuwenhove, Rik. *Introduction to Medieval Theology*. 2nd ed. Cambridge – New York: Cambridge University Press, 2022.

Van Veldhuijsen, Peter. "The Question on the Possibility of an Eternally Created World: Bonaventura and Thomas Aquinas." In *The Eternity of the World: In the Thought of Thomas Aquinas and His Contemporaries*, edited by J.B.M. Wissink, 20-38. Leiden: Brill, 1990.

Vetö, Etienne. *The Breath of God: An Essay on the Holy Spirit in the Trinity*. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2019.

de Villalmonte, Alejandro. "El argumento 'Ex caritate' en la Doctrina Trinitaria de San Buenaventura." *Revista Española de Teología* 13 (1953): 521-547.

———. "Orientación Cristocéntrica en la Teología de San Buenaventura." *Estudios Franciscanos* 59 (1958): 321-372.

———. "El Padre Plenitud Fontal de la Deidad." In Bougerol, *S. Bonaventura 1274-1974*, vol. 4, 221-242.

Von Balthasar, Hans Urs. *The Glory of the Lord: A Theological Aesthetics*. Vol. 2, *Studies in Theological Style: Clerical Styles*. Translated by Andrew Louth, Francis McDonagh and Brian McNeil. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1984.

Wass, Meldon. *The Infinite God and the Summa Fratris Alexandri*. Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1964.

Weinandy, Thomas. *The Father's Spirit of Sonship: Reconceiving the Trinity*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1995.

———. *Does God Suffer?* Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 2000.

Wood, Jordan Daniel. "The Father's Kenosis: A Defense of Bonaventure on Intra-trinitarian Acts." *Pro Ecclesia: A Journal of Catholic and Evangelical Theology* 30 (2021): 3-31.

Woźniak, Robert Józef, *Primitas et plenitudo. Dios Padre en la teología Trinitaria de san Buenaventura*. Pamplona: Ediciones Universidad de Navarra, 2007.

———. "La teología de la mediación de Cristo en las obras sistemáticas de san Buenaventura." *Scripta theologica* 49 (2017): 327-349.

Zamora, Angelina Magdalena (Sr. Mary Kolbe). *Ecclesiological Elements in the Theology of St. Bonaventure*. Tesi Gregoriana: Serie Teologia 245. Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2020.

Zas Friz de Col, Rossano. "La manifestazione visibile dello Spirito Santo secondo San Bonaventura." In *La Personalità dello Spirito Santo*. Edited by Sergio Tanzarella, 225-235. Cinisello Balsalmo: San Paolo, 1998.

Zigrossi, Antonio. *Saggio sul neoplatonismo di s. Bonaventura. Il concetto di unità e la struttura del reale come problema teologico*. Firenze: Edizioni Studi Francescani, 1954.